

.....

A
R E P L Y
TO THE
FARTHER ENQUIRY

INTO
The Meaning of the DEMONIACKS in
the NEW TESTAMENT, &c.

.....

[Price 1s. 6d.]

00000000000000000000000000000000

Y B E Y

THE OT

FARTHER ENQUIRY

OTMI

The Meaning of the Demoniacs in
the New Testament, Etc.

[illegible]

[Page 12. 6A.]

S. T. P. A. R. O. A. B. J. C. O.
A

100. 5

R E P L Y

TO THE FARTHER ENQUIRY

I N T O

The Meaning of the DEMONIACKS in
the NEW TESTAMENT;

As far as the ESSAY towards vindicating the
Literal Sense of them is concerned.

By the AUTHOR of the ESSAY.

Θαλῆς, Πυθαγόρας, Πλάτων, οἱ Στωϊκοὶ ΔΑΪΜΟΝΑΣ
ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἐξίστας ψυχικὰς εἶναι τὴν ἡρώα τὰς
κεχωρισμένας ψυχὰς τῶν σωμάτων.

PLUT. *de Placit. Philos.* l. i. c. 8.

Quid? qui aut fortes, aut claros, aut potentes viros tradunt post
mortem ad Deos pervenisse, eosque esse ipsos, quos nos colere,
precari, venerarique soleamus, nonne expertes sunt religio-
num omnium?

CIC. *de Nat. Deor.* l. i. *prop. fin.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. ROBERTS, at the Oxford-Arms in
Warwick-Lane. MDCCXXXVIII.

REPLY

TO THE

MEMORIAL OF THE

AMERICAN

PEOPLE

IN

RESPONSE TO THE

MEMORIAL OF THE

AMERICAN

PEOPLE

T H E
P R E F A C E.

THE Design of the following Sheets is chiefly to examine into the Meaning of the Word Demon, in both the Heathen Writings, and the Scriptures; with an Intent to expose some Inconsistencies of the former, and to vindicate the true Sense of the latter. The Reader will, I hope, see it clearly proved, that the Difference, which the Gospels are said "to put constantly" betwixt ὁ διάβολος and δαίμων, Preface to Farther Enquiry, is merely verbal, and that They assign to these one and the same Nature. The Notion, that Demons were the Souls of departed Men, will appear to be far from being general among Pagan Authors, but never espoused by those of the Old and New Testament. So that there can be no

Pretence or Ground to reject the literal Sense, (never to be rejected without Necessity) of the many miraculous Cures, which our SAVIOUR made of such, as are represented to have been afflicted by those Beings.

NOT but these Parts of the Gospels themselves clearly shew, what the true Nature of the Scripture Demons was. For, as there are no other Texts, wherein so large Mention is made of such Beings, these ought to be first consider'd, and to determine the Signification of all the rest; which they are more likely to do, than to receive Light from them. However, to cut off all Ground of Complaint, I have proceeded much in the Enquirer's own Method.

*I HAVE also endeavoured to vindicate such Parts of my Essay, as the Farther Enquiry has excepted against; not by answering some loose unconnected Sentences taken from thence, but by considering, with what Attention I could, the whole Course of the Reasoning, and
by*

by replying to it in a *Way*, which appeared to myself to be plain, easy, and satisfactory. How far I have succeeded, the unprejudic'd Reader is left to judge.

IT may be proper here to rectify a Mistake I committed in the Essay, and which I have been advertised of by a Letter from a learned and worthy Friend, whose Words are. “ An Argument you use is stronger, than you apprehended it to be. You observe, Essay, p. 81, 82. That the Enquirer, in citing Matt. iv. 24. has omitted the Words, and Torments, whether with or without Design you do not determine; that we have no Reason to suspect their being genuine; they are only found wanting in two Copies, and those of no Character for Correctness; that Theophylact, as Doctor Mill tells us, omitted them industriously, &c. Now the Truth of the Thing is, that the Words and Torments are omitted by no Copies, nor
“ by

“ by Theophylact. You was led into
 “ this Opinion by following Kuster’s
 “ Edition of Mill, which here is faulty.
 “ Look into Mill’s own Edition, and you
 “ will find that κὶ σεληνιαζομένους are the
 “ Words omitted, and that Doctor
 “ Mill had no Note upon the Words
 “ κὶ βασάνοις. The Enquirer therefore
 “ could have no Reasons to omit those
 “ Words from Copies or ancient Wri-
 “ ters.”——I will only observe that
 no Reason for the Omission in the En-
 quiry, no Answer to the Argument, even
 even as I had stated it before, is given us
 in the Farther Enquiry.

 E R R A T A.

P 19. l. 23. read as can be imagined from the Origin of evil
 . Demons. p. 21. l. 12. read *Areimanius*. p. 29. l. 13.
 for or read *and*. p. 31. l. 4. read to signify the Beings, which
 the Jesus. p. 37. l. 4. read *Heathens*. p. 44. l. 26. read
 third. p. 54. l. 12. read in what he thought the Heathen Sense.
 p. 59. l. 2. for these read *it*. p. 61. Marg. read *σίλα*. p. 66.
 l. 23. read *any one*. p. 69. l. 14. read *may now be concluded*.
 p. 78. l. 2. a full Stop after *Infliction*.

Erata in the ESSAY.

P 9. Marg. read *ἀνίστασθαι*. p. 10. l. 24. read *last*. p. 18.
 . Marg. read *Deo*. p. 21. Marg. read *might*. p. 36. l. 8.
 read *usual*. p. 64. l. 17. read *not concerning*. p. 70. l. 12.
 read *proceeded*. p. 71. Marg. read *immissum*. p. 94. l. 30.
 read *It is*. p. 98. l. 5. read *πάντας τὰς*. p. 122. l. 10. read
Presumption.

A

R E P L Y

T O T H E

FARTHER ENQUIRY

Into the Meaning of the DEMONIACKS
in the NEW TESTAMENT, &c.

I NEED not repeat the Reasons, which induced me to trouble the World on this Subject. The Reader has already had them in my former *Essay*. A true Regard to *Scripture*, a just Desire to explain it rightly, to remove all reasonable Difficulties, and to vindicate its *plain, obvious, literal* Sense, are Motives, which I apprehend to be sufficient. To this end, I went thro' the whole Scheme of the *Enquirer*, much in his own Method, leaving nothing unconsidered, which I thought material to the Question. It will not be expected, that I examine the *Farther Enquiry* in the same manner, as a great Part of it does not relate to me, but to a Gentleman, who is able to do himself Justice.

B

However,

However, it may be proper to vindicate my own Reasoning; which I set about with the greater pleasure, as I persuade my self, I am vindicating, at the same time, the true Meaning of the *New Testament*.

THE first Point, in which this Gentleman differs from me, is, Whether it tends to "settle the Meaning of the *Demoniacks* in the *New Testament*, to take notice of the general *Notion of Demons among the antient Greeks?*" I thought it did not, being deceived, if I was deceived, by the united Sense of some of the best Criticks both ancient and modern, who are quoted and referred to, *Essay* p. 8. This Gentleman (*Farther Enquiry*, p. 2.) "thinks it is of the utmost Importance, in order to understand many Passages of both *Old and New Testament* too;" and therefore "proceeds in his own Method." And indeed I can't wonder at him. His whole Scheme depends on bringing the Notion, which some of the Heathens had of *Demons*, into the *Scripture*, and must therefore stand or fall with this Observation. But then it wou'd, methinks, have been kind to have favoured us with some Reason to prove the Truth of it. It does not look well in one especially, who "questions whether any Names of great and good Men wou'd pass for Proof in a Point of" a like "Nature," *Farther Enquiry*, p. 27. to leave us no other Proof of a Matter of Consequence, than his own bare Assertion. "He that *insists* upon Reasons," ought surely to
give

give them; and if we are not to "be born down by Names and Authorities," neither are these to be despised in general, or contradicted without some clear Evidence. In short, without such, there will ever be Reason with a modest Person, to acquiesce in the joint Opinion of "great and good Men."

It was then certainly incumbent on this Gentleman, at setting out, to have made this Foundation of his whole Scheme sure and firm, and to have shewed, that it is of so much consequence, as he pretends, to the "settling the Meaning of the *Demoniacs* in the *New Testament*," to consider the Heathen Notion of *Demons*. For if it should not be so, then we have here a great deal of time spent in vain, and a great deal of Learning to no end or purpose.—And till I am better informed, I must still be of the Opinion, that this Principle is not true. For is it certain, or even probable, that the *Heathen* and *Scripture* Meaning of all Words is the same? Can we think, that the *inspired* Writers of the *New Testament* borrowed their Sentiments or their Language from the *Poets* or the *Philosophers* of the *Greeks* and *Romans*? If not, may not *St. Matthew* or *St. Luke* use the Word *δαίμονιον* in a different Sense from that of *Homer* or *Hesiod*? This Gentleman, *Farther Enquiry*, p. 9. owns, that "*Philo*" having "a plain Rule, even that of *Scripture*, to go by, — could know something of *Angels*, which the Heathen World knew nothing of."

Why might not he then, why may not we, by the help of the same *plain Rule*, together with one still *plainer* than that, which he enjoyed, know something more of *Demons* than they could? “*Thales* and *Pythagoras*, and their Followers, had only their own Imaginations to direct them.” This was probably the Case of others. We shall see hereafter some Instances of their Confusion and Uncertainty in these Matters. And are these the Men, from whose Imaginations we are to learn the *Scripture-Meaning* of *Demons*? No surely; Be the Dreams of the Poets, and the Inconsistencies of the Philosophers, never so many; the Sense of the *Sacred Writings* is one and the same, determinate and invariable, neither taken from, nor to be judged of by, either of the others, but proceeding directly and immediately from the Eternal Fountain of Truth itself *.

THE Reader may by this time see, and will in the course of these Reflections see much more clearly, how little Truth there is in an Assertion we have, *Farther Enquiry*, p. 25. “The *Scriptures* are to be constantly interpreted agreeable to the Heathen Notion of the Word “*Demon*.” For was this their Notion clear, certain, uniform? Did they never differ from one

* I beg leave here to set down the Testimony of a Gentleman, to whom my Adversary has been very much obliged, in the *Farther Enquiry*. “Now the Signification of Words in *Scripture*, is “to be esteemed and taken only according to the *Scripture’s* Use, “tho’ other Writers use them otherwise.”

Mede’s Works, Ed. 1664. p. 782.
another?

another? Nay, did not the same Person sometimes vary from himself? The *Enquirer*, p. 4. contended, That "this Notion of *Demons*,
 " that they were the *Souls* of such as once had
 " lived upon Earth, is so UNIVERSALLY allow'd
 " by Jews and Christians, as well as by Heathens, that scarce will any one dispute it." I observe, in the *Farther Enquiry*, p. 51. this contradicted. We are here told, That "it was
 " never in" his "Intention to say, that all
 " Christians UNIVERSALLY, and all others too,
 " were of this opinion, that all *Demons* were
 " human *Souls*, and nothing else. It was very
 " plain to every body, and well known, that
 " many that were called *Demons*, never were
 " supposed to have been in such Bodies as ours
 " are." What this Gentleman's Intention was, is best known to himself. His first Words lye before the Reader, who is to judge, whether they do not contain the Sentiment he is at present pleased to renounce. I beg leave to add, that his Argument requires the same. For if *all Demons* were not the *Souls of departed Men*, then the Word *Demon* among the Heathens will be necessarily equivocal, and consequently the Use of it among them can be no manner of Rule or Help to us, in settling the Meaning of the Word in the *New Testament*. Tho' we should allow, that this is here to be interpreted according to their Sense, yet it will still be uncertain, in which of their Senses we must take and explain it; and it *may* still be true, that we
 are

are to understand it of *evil Angels*, or *Devils*, properly so called.

OF this more by and by. At present let us attend to this Gentleman's Explication of his own Reasoning. He tells us, "The thing" he "was proving, was, that *Heathens*, Jews, and "Christians had all allowed, that *Demons* were "originally thought to be the Souls of departed Men. They were nothing but the Souls "of departed Men *at first*." I would not willingly misunderstand, much less, misrepresent, him: But it appears at least to be here implied, that the *oldest* Heathens agreed in this Sentiment. The Truth of which shall be presently considered. He goes on, "The Heathen "Gods were *Demons*; and they had *all* been "Men. But then, when Alterations in the "System of Demonology were made by *Christians*, the Idea of *Devils* was substituted to "the Word *Demons*:—And then, what was "once the current Doctrine was lost; and all "was resolved into *evil Spirits*, or *Apostate Angels*." *Farther Enquiry*, p. 52. These Words I take to contain a principal Part of this Gentleman's Scheme, and shall therefore consider them a little more particularly. And true it is, here are almost as many Mistakes, as Words. For,

FIRST, the Heathen Gods *had* not *all* been *Men*; and therefore, neither were these called *Demons* on this account. Their Genealogies, in general, are too various and uncertain to be relied upon. A great part of them, it is certain, are
extremely

extremely fabulous and ridiculous. That *Venus* proceeded from the Sea, and *Minerva* from the Brain of *Jupiter*, are idle and incredible Accounts. It will be impossible to prove that they, as well as many others, ever had any Existence upon Earth at all * ; much less can we think, that “ the very great Goodness of the Beings, *i. e.* their great Usefulness to Mankind, “ was that which made them be treated and “ looked upon as *Demons*, and placed in Heaven.” This cannot be affirmed of all : We find in *Plutarch*, a Distinction of the *Gods*, into such as were *useful* and *prejudicial* ; as Instances of these last, he mentions the *Diræ*, the *Furies*, and *Mars*, whose Violence and Cruelty they endeavoured to avert †. And as to the rest,

* It is, I think, a much more probable Account, that the *Dii majorum gentium* were originally the *Sun*, *Planets*, and *Elements*, or denoted some *Intelligences*, which were thought to preside in, and over, them. Learned Men are generally agreed, that these were the first Objects of *Idolatry*, long before either the Worship of *Images*, or of *dead Men*, came in fashion. Thus *Jupiter* might signify the *Air*, or *Heaven*, *Apollo* the *Sun*, *Vulcan* *Fire*, &c. Of this Opinion was *Dr. Bekker*, notwithstanding his great Prejudices on this Subject ; *Vid. le Monde enchanté*, V. 1. p. 17, 18. *Vid. Tull. de Nat. Deor.* l. 1. especially the Sentence I have chosen for a *Motto*, which may serve to shew, that some of the greatest Philosophers disbelieved the Opinion entirely, that the *Gods* were *dead Men*.

† Τὰς Θεὰς διείλον, εἰς τε τὸ βλάπλον, καὶ τὸ ὠφελεῖν — τὰς δὲ βλάπλοντας, Πηνάας, Ἐρινύας, Ἄρην, τὰς αὖτε ἀφ’ οὐρανίου χαλεπὰς ὄντας καὶ βιάσας. And it is remarkable, that he, in a future distinct Head, mentions those Men who, for their Benefits to Mankind, had been esteemed *Gods* ; such as *Hercules*, &c. Which implies, that those he named before, *viz. Jupiter, Juno, Mercury, and Ceres*, &c. had never, in his opinion, belonged to this Class. *De Plat. Philos.* L. 1. cap. 6.

we must at least say, that if they were for their Virtues taken into Heaven, the far greater Part of them much degenerated, after they came there. However useful they might be here below, most of them were famous for little else above, but for Rapes, Adulteries, Incests, Thefts, and other Vices of the most fatal Consequence to Mankind. This is the general Account of them; and if we set it aside, it will not be easy to evince, that *they had been Men* at all, that they were not *imaginary* Beings.

It may be proper, in the next place, to observe, that the Heathen Gods were not *universally* called *Demons*. If some Writers confound these together, others as clearly distinguish them. *Plutarch* having observed*, that *Homer* used the Word *Δαίμων* for God, adds, “ That *Hesiod* was “ the first, who clearly and distinctly proposed “ four kinds of rational Beings; the *Gods*, then “ the many good *Demons*, afterwards *Heroes*, “ and lastly *Men*.” This Division we find followed by many of the Philosophers afterwards. *Jamblicus* represents *Pythagoras* saying, that things excel according to their Priority in time, and then adding, “ That in general the *Gods* “ excel the *Demons*, these the *Semi-Gods*, and

* Ἑλλήνων δὲ Ὅμηρος μὴ φαίνεται κοινῶς ἀμφοτέροις χρώμενος τοῖς ὀνόμασι, καὶ τὰς Θεὰς ἔστιν ὅτι δαίμονας προσαγορεύει. Ἡσίοδος δὲ καθαρῶς καὶ διακριμένως πρῶτος ἐξέθηκε τῶν λογικῶν τέσσαρα γένη, θεὰς, εἴτα δαίμονας πολλὰς καὶ γαδρὰς, εἴτα ἥρωας, εἴτα ἀνθρώπους.

Plut. de Oracul. defectu.

“ the

“ the *Heroes Men*.” * So also *Porphry* makes him teach his Followers “ to speak well of the “ *Divine Being*, of *Demons*, and *Heroes*†.” This may likewise be observed in the three first Lines of the *Golden Verses* ascribed to this Philosopher. And to mention no more, we find *Plutarch* using this very Distinction. In his Books of the *Opinions of Philosophers*, he treats of the Nature of God in one Chapter, and begins the next with saying‡, “ After what has been said of the Gods, “ we are now to treat of *Demons*, and *Heroes*.”

LET me now ask the *Enquirer* himself, Whether the *Gods* of the Heathen were the only, or the proper *Demons*? If he thinks they were, to what purpose so express and frequent a Distinction between them? Could *Pythagoras* believe them to be of the same Nature, when he taught, that the one kind excelled the other? Was *Plutarch* capable of being guilty of so gross a Tautology and Absurdity, as, after he had represented the Opinions of the Philosophers concerning the Nature of the Gods, to go on, in a fresh Chapter, to give different Sentiments of the same Men concerning the same Beings? No, both he and they by describing them distinctly, shewed, that they conceived them to be distinct.

* Καὶ καθόλου, τὴς μὲν θεῶς τῶν δαιμόνων, ἐκείνης δὲ τῶν ἡμιθεῶν, τὴς ἥρωας δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

De Vit. Pythag. Ed. Amstel. 1707. p. 28, 29.

† Παρήναι δὲ, περὶ μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ δαιμονίου καὶ ἥρωα γένους εὐφημον εἶναι. Ibid. p. 39.

‡ Παρακασιμένως δὲ τῶ περὶ θεῶν λόγῳ τὸν περὶ δαιμόνων καὶ ἥρωων ἐσαρτήσας. l. I. c. 8.

To proceed. As this Division plainly makes it appear, that the *Demons* were not the same with the *Gods*, so it is equally evident from it, that they were thought separate from the *Souls of departed Men*. I would not be understood to say, that the Word was never used for these, or that none of the Heathens ever considered them as such. But I affirm, that their best Philosophers, when they expressed their Sense of them particularly and designedly, very clearly spake of these two sorts of Beings, as distinct from each other. We learn this from *Plutarch*, in the Place before cited. He says expressly, That “*Thales, Pythagoras, Plato, and the Stoicks* believed the *Demons* to be spiritual Substances, “ and the *Heroes* to be Souls separated from “ their Bodies.” Words can hardly be plainer than these. And therefore every of the foregoing Divisions, where *Demons* are distinguished from *Heroes*, proves, that those “ were ” not “ originally thought the *Souls of departed Men*.” To go on,

I CAN by no means agree with the Gentleman, in the Account he gives us, *Farther Enquiry*, p. 6 and 7. “ When the obvious Question “ was put, what became of the Souls of Men, “ when separated from their Bodies, they replenished the *Air*, the *Æther*, and several “ Regions with them.” — Hence “ a great “ many Distinctions in *Spiritual Subsistencies*. — “ Angels might be distinguished from *Heroes*, “ and *Heroes* from *Demons*, and *Demons* from “ Souls,

“ Souls, and the several Souls might be ranged
 “ in several Classes or Ranks, according to what
 “ they had done here.” If it be meant, that
Demons and *Heroes* are only different Sorts of
departed Souls; I must beg leave to say, that
 this is absolutely inconsistent with *Plutarch's*
 Account, who expressly represents the Opinion
 of the Ancients to be, that *Heroes* only, in con-
 tradistinction to *Demons*, were *departed Souls*.
 According to him, they were both thought to
 agree in this, that they were *Souls* or *Spirits*,
 but to differ, in that the one were *barely such*,
 the others were *separate from their Bodies*.

LET us examine the Account just cited a little
 more particularly. “ *Thales* taught the Immor-
 “ tality of the Soul—and replenished the
 “ World with them.” It is true, he is recorded
 by *Aristotle* and *Cicero* to have taught, that *all*
things were full of Gods. But, if the former of
 these knew his Meaning, it is as certain, that
 he did not intend to say any thing concerning
 the State or Place of *departed Souls*. *Aristotle's*
 Words are cited, *F. E.* p. 5. and imply that, in his
 Opinion, that Notion of *Thales* proceeded from
 another Notion, That “ all the World was ani-
 “ mated,” or that a “ Soul was mixed with, or
 “ pervaded, the Universe”*. Either therefore this

* *Arist. de Animâ*, l. 1. c. 8.

Vid. *Tull. de Leg.* l. 2. §. 11.

Plato also taught, that *all things were full of Gods*, but he spake
 of the several *Intelligences*, which directed the Courses of the *Sun*,
Planets, &c. as clearly appears from his Dialogue, *de leg.* L. 10.
 § 12.

Gentleman must leave off thinking, that
 “ there seems to be no Difference in saying,
 “ that the World was full of *Demons*, and that
 “ it was full of *Gods*,” or else he must be forced to grant, that the Word *Demons* in the Sense of *Thales*, as interpreted by *Aristotle*, signifies nothing like *separate Souls of Men*.

As to the other Philosophers that believed the Immortality of the Soul, they were either of the Opinion of *Pythagoras*, or of *Socrates*. Either of which is inconsistent with the Notion of *departed Souls* being situated in the Air, and looked upon as *Demons*. It is well known, that *Pythagoras* held the Doctrine of *Transmigration*, and he was followed in this by three Parts in four of the Heathen World, I might also add, by many of the *Jews*. But it is not easily conceivable, how those who believed, that Souls passed from one Body to another, could assign them a Situation in the *Air*, &c. Or, if what *Laertius* says of *Pythagoras's* Doctrine be true, “ That such Souls as were pure, “ *Mercury* conducted to the higher Regions, [*ἐπὶ τὸν ὑψιστον*, which may be rendered, *to the Presence of the Supreme Being*] still the Case will be the same. *The highest Regions* will hardly be allow'd to signify the *Air**, which that Philosopher is said to have replenished with such

*If *Laertius* represents *Pythagoras* teaching, “ That the *Air* was “ full of Souls”, meaning *departed Souls*, I think there is a plain Inconsistency in his Account; since, in the End of the Paragraph, he disposes of both *good* and *bad* ones in a very different way.

Souls. So that, on either Supposition, he appears to have assigned these other Habitations than those which this Gentleman has allotted.

THE Sentiments of *Socrates* we have thus represented from *Plato*, "The Souls of the Good after Death are in an happy Estate, united to God in a blessed inaccessible Place; the Bad, in convenient Places, suffer condign Punishment; but to define what those Places are, is *hominis* νοῦν μὴ ἔχοντος*." We see how this truly wise Heathen disposed of *departed Souls*, without the least Intimation that he believed them to become *Demons*. And I think it worth our Notice, that tho' there have been many Disputes concerning the *Demon* of *Socrates*, whether it was a *good* or an *ill* Spirit; none, that I remember, ever suggested, that it was the Soul of any departed Person. And Mr. *Stanly* not only cites several of the *Fathers* to prove it to have been a *good Angel*, but says, that "*Maximus Tyrius* and *Apuleius*" (to whom perhaps some Persons will give more credit) "describe [him] in such a manner, that they want only the Name of a *good Angel*†."

WHAT the true Notion of *Plato* was concerning the State of *departed Souls*, is not altogether so certain. It has already appeared, that *Plutarch* reckons him among those, that distinguished these from *Demons*. *Virgil*, who is

* *Stanly's Lives of the Philosophers*, in *Socrates*, ch. 5. § 1.

† *Ibid.* ch. 6.

thought

thought to have follow'd his Doctrine, in his 6th *Æneid*, makes the Residence of the Good to be the *Elysian Fields*, till, after a thousand Years, they were sent into new Bodies :

*Has omnes, ubi mille rotamvolvère per annos,
Lethæum ad fluvium Deus evocat agmine magno:
Scilicet immemores supera ut convexa revísant,
Rursus & incipiant in corpora velle reverti.* l. 751.

Here, certainly, there is no room to imagine, that he thought they were *Demons*. If it be said, that the Ancients believed, that not the *Souls*, but the εἰδολα, were in *Elysium*; I own, there is room from a Passage in *Homer*, *Odyss.* xi. 600. to suppose he thought so*. But *Virgil* says nothing like it, in the Passage before us. And indeed, this Supposition wou'd only increase our Difficulties, and perplex the Enquiry still more. We should only find it harder to tell, what was meant by the εἶδολον, and to account for the holding a long Conversation with it. Besides, 'tis observable, that, according to *Socrates*, the Receptacle of departed Souls is called ᾠδης, the Word, which the *Scriptures* use for the same Place; and of their State here, he professes not to have sufficient Knowledge. This *Plato* † as-

* And yet he makes *Patroclus* desire *Achilles* to bury him, telling him, that when once that is done,

——— εἰ γὰρ ἔτ' αὐτίς
νίσσομαι ἐξ Αἴδαο——— Il. ψ. 78.
† ——— εἰς εἰδῶς ἰκαίῃς περὶ τῶν ἐν ᾠδῇ. Apolog. Socrat.

tures us, who must be supposed to be of his Opinion: Which seems to contradict the Notion of their being supposed to be lodged in the *Air*, and to become *Demons*.

IF, after all, there are some Passages in this Author, which favour the Opinion of *Hesiod*, I can only look upon them, as so many Instances of the Uncertainty and Confusion, which the Greatest among the Heathens laboured under, when they talked on this Subject. The Light of Nature, how sufficient soever it may in *Theory* seem, yet was found in *Fact* to lead even those, who enjoyed it most perfectly, and used it best, into endless Difficulties, and Errors.— Not that the Citations, the *Enquirer* has chosen to produce, do all speak directly to his Point. That which we have from the *Cratylus*, *Farther Enquiry*, p. 11. manifestly proves too much. *Hesiod*, “and other Poets, say well; who say, “that when any good Man dies, he obtains “great Honour, and becomes a *Demon*, according to the Meaning of the Word,” [κατὰ τὴν τῆς Φρονήσεως ἐπωνυμίαν, he alludes here to the Derivation of δαίμων, from δαήμων, *sciens*: and therefore this ought to have been translated, according to the Likeness, or Relation, this Name bears to the Word *Wisdom*] “and I agree to this” [It would have been better rendered, *For which Reason, I also think, ταύτῃ ἐν τίθεμαι ἢ ἐγὼ*] “every wise Man, that is a good Man, is a “*Demon*, WHETHER HE IS ALIVE, OR DEAD, “and is rightly called a *Demon*.” The Reader may

may here see the Effects of a warm Imagination, and of relying on *Etymologies* too much; which occasioned the understanding the Word *Demon*, in so loose, general, and indeterminate a Sense, as to take in all *wise Men*, ALIVE, AS WELL AS DEAD. And can the Gentleman, I am disputing with, think this to be a just Explication of the Notion of *Demons*, among the ancient Heathen? If this was *Plato's* real Sentiment, he not only went much farther than *Hesiod*; or any of the others, but is utterly irreconcilable to himself; since he maintains the Position in another of his Works, *That every Demon is of a middle Nature between God and Men*, πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον μεταξύ ἐστὶ θεῶν καὶ θνητῶν*... Again, in the same Place, we find the Notion of *Heroes* as much contracted, as that of *Demons* was enlarged. *Plutarch* has represented him, with others, as saying, that those were separated Souls, *in general*. But here he affirms, that "ALL of them were born from Love, either of a God with a mortal Woman, or of mortal Men with Goddesses." Equally restrained is his Notion of *Demons*, expressed in his *Apology*. He calls them, *the spurious Sons of Gods*, ἢ ἐκ νυμφῶν ἢ ἐκ τίνων ἄλλων, *either from Nymphs, or from some others*. And this without determining, whether they were so to be called in their Life-time, or only after they were dead. There is here not one Word of *Souls*, much less of such as were departed.

* *In Convivio.*

So that, according to the celebrated *Plato*, sometimes *all wise Men*, ALIVE or dead, sometimes only the *spurious Sons of the Gods*, were *Demons*. If this Gentleman still thinks "*Plato's* " Sentiments clear enough," I must leave him to make the best of them: But, I hope, he will be a little careful to reconcile him to himself, and to the other Philosophers, before they are represented as a Rule, to guide us to the right understanding and interpreting of *Holy Scripture*.

My Readers, are, I fear, tired with so dry a Disquisition. But, I hope, the Importance of the Subject, and the Stress, which has been laid on the Opinions of the Heathens, will procure me their Excuse, — nay, their Patience, while I observe farther, that there was not only a Belief of *good Demons*, but also of such as were *wicked*, and *noxious*. This I can't but think of the utmost Consequence to remember; since it cannot, with any Shew of Reason, be pretended, that these were the *Souls of departed Men**. According to all Suppositions, evil Souls were,

* As this is a Point of some moment, it may be proper to be particular in laying the Evidence before the Reader. *Homer* speaks of *perjur'd Persons* being punished by the *Furies* under the *Earth*.

—— ἱπνύεις, αἶψ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν

Ἀνδράπης τίννεται, ὅτις κ' ἐπίορκον ἔμυσσε.

Il. T. 260.

So Virgil universally,

—— at læva malorum

Exercet pœnas, & ad impia tartara mittit.

Æn. 6. 543.

D

——Continuè

were, after Death, either shut up in a Place of Horror and Punishment, incapable of molesting, or so much as approaching, others; or else, they passed into the Bodies of Brutes. Nor do we read of any of them returning to this World, unless such as were not incurable, who were thought, by way of Punishment, or after a severe Purgation, to animate new Bodies. It may therefore reasonably be demanded, what *those evil Demons* were imagined to be? And, if we must interpret *Scripture* according to the Heathen Accunts, whether *these* may not afford us some Light in the present Enquiry?

THAT there were some *evil Demons* believed, this Gentleman has, I think, owned; tho',

—Continuò fontes ultrix accincta flagello
Tisiphone quatit insultans: torvosque sinistra
Intentans angues.— 572.

Here he shuts up all wicked Men irrecoverably, without any Hint that they became evil *Demons*. See v. 581—742.

Socrates said of impure Souls, that they wander about in a State of Punishment for a time, but soon are assigned other Bodies, ὥστε τάχῃ πάλιν πίπτειν εἰς ἄλλο σῶμα. Plat. Phæd. § 22. A little before, he had said, ἐνδύσθαι δὲ, ὥσπερ εἰκὸς εἰς τὰ τοιαῦτα ἦδη ὅποια ἂν ᾖ καὶ μεμελετηκυῖαι τύχῳσιν ἐν τῷ βίῳ. As Instances of which he says, that idle and luxurious Souls would pass into *Asses*, &c. injurious Tyrants into *Wolves*. And afterwards, § 45. he expressly says of very wicked Men, that they were cast into *Tartarus*, ὅθι ἔστι ἐκβαίνουσιν. *Pythagoras's* Sentiments are thus expressed by *Laertius*, τὰς δὲ ἀκαθάρτους μήτε ἐκίναίς πελάζουσιν, μήτε ἀλλήλαις, διῶσθαι δὲ ἐν ἀρρήκτοις δισμοῖς ὑπὸ ἱερυνύων.—Lastly, *Plutarch* is clear as to this Matter. He says, that “the Incurable are miserably
“and cruelly destroyed by the *Erinnys*, and plunged into a Place
“which cannot be seen, or described.” *De his qui serò à numine puniuntur*. Towards the End of another of his Treatises, *de occultè vivendo*, he says, the Way of such as have lived wickedly, εἰς ἔρεβός τε καὶ βάραθρον ὠδεῖται τὰς ψυχὰς, drives Souls into *Erebus* and a Pit; or, in *Scripture-Phrase*, into *Darkness* and the Deep.

not

not without Difficulty and Perplexity. I will not contend with him, whether *Homer* be to be understood of these Beings, or not; having other Proofs that there were such, which are incontestable. I am certain, he is much more to the present Purpose, than *Ocellus Lucanus*, who is brought in, *Farther Enquiry*, p. 19. and again, p. 41. by mere Force and Violence, to account for the Origin of *evil Demons*. This Gentleman translates him thus: "Such as are
 " begot with Injury and Intemperance, are
 " wicked, and will be κακοδαίμονες, *evil De-*
 " *mons*, and detested by Gods, and Demons,
 " and Men, and Families, and States." Whereas, the Truth is, that *Ocellus*, in the Passage before us, had no thoughts of giving his Notions concerning the Original of any sort of *Demons*. In another Part of his Work*, he intimated, as indeed he does here, what he imagined them to be; *Beings, of a middle Nature, between Gods and Men*: But here he is speaking upon a Subject, as different as can be imagined. He had been considering the true End and Design of human Mixtures; and the Mischiefs of coming together, for any other Purpose, than that of begetting Children. And then it follows, "And if such shall beget any
 " Issue, with Injury and Intemperance, they that
 " are born will be *wicked*, [or rather *miserable*, as I should chuse to translate μοχθηροί,] " and

* Ἐν μὲν ἄλλῳ τὸ τῶν Θεῶν, ἐν τῇ γῇ ἄνθρωποι, ἐν τῷ μετασίῳ τόπῳ δαίμονες. Cap. 3. Inter *Opuscula* edit. per Gale.

“ UNHAPPY, and detested, or reckoned impure, by the *Gods*, and *Demons*, and *Men*, and *Families*, and *States**.” I am very sorry to have such Occasion to complain. But surely, we see here either a *Liberty*, or a *Carelessness*, which will bear no Excuse. I am unwilling to think, the Gentleman *intended* to impose upon his Readers; and therefore must, in Charity, suppose, that he never gave himself the Trouble to look into *Ocellus Lucanus*, which must have convinced him, that there was nothing here to his Purpose, but the bare Sound; but that he took this on Trust, from some other Hand.

I now attend him to Page 20. “ The *Chaldæans* had a Notion of *Two Gods*, the one the Cause of Good, the other of Evil: The one *Oromasdes*, the other *Arimanius*: But these have nothing to do with the present Enquiry, which is to trace out the Origin of *Demons*, which were supposed all along to be *Ghosts*.” If it be meant here, that some *Demons* were supposed to be *Ghosts*, and that the Enquiry is concerning *these only*, I agree, that the *Chaldæan* Notions are nothing to this Purpose.

* Οἱ γὰρ καθάπαξ μὴ διὰ παιδοποιῶν συναπτόμενοι, ἀδικήσουσι τὰ τιμωτάτα τῆς κοινωνίας συστήματα, εἰ δὴ γενήσων οἱ τοιοῦτοι μεθ' ὕβρεως καὶ ἀκρασίας, μοχθηροὶ οἱ γινόμενοι, καὶ ΚΑΚΟΔΑΪΜΟΝΕΣ ἵσονται —x, τ, λ. ch. 4. The Sense I have assigned to the Word κακοδαίμων, is justified by another Sentence in the same Chapter. Where talking of the Contentions which follow unequal Marriages, he says, *when these things happen, not only Families, but Cities are UNHAPPY*, εἰ μόνον τὰς οἰκίας ΚΑΚΟΔΑΪΜΟΝΑΣ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς πόλεις συμβαίνει γινέσθαι.

But

But if the Question be, as I imagine it is, what were the Sentiments of the Ancients concerning *evil Demons*? then, surely, I may take it for granted, that the Distinction above is worth our Notice, and has some Relation to the Subject; because this Gentleman, Page 41. seems to own as much. “The *Chaldæans*, it is certain, entertained the Notion of a good and evil Being, very early. They supposed *two* Principles, a good *Demon*, and an *evil Demon*: “The former’s Name was *Zeus*, and *Oromasdes*; the latter was called *Ades*, and *Arcimanius*.” * This he tells us from *Laertius*; and I must beg the Reader to observe, that here we have, in express Words, an *evil Demon*, which can’t be pretended to have been the Soul of a departed Man. And therefore we are not to be surprized, if we should meet with the same Notion among the *Greeks*; since we are told, the *Chaldæans* “had this Notion, before ever the *Egyptians* had it; and from these latter it “was, that the *Greeks* derived their Notion of “*Demons*.”

PLUTARCH †, in one of his Treatises, thus represents the Opinion of some of the An-

* We must not here omit the Testimony of *Plutarch*, de *Isid.* & *Osirid.* Νομίζουσι γὰρ οἱ μὲν Θεοὺς εἶναι δύο, καθάπερ ἀντιτέχνους, τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἀγαθῶν, τὸν δὲ φαύλων δημιουργόν; οἱ δὲ τὸν μὲν ἀμείμονα Θεόν, τὸν δὲ ἕτερον, δαίμονα καλεῖσιν, ὥσπερ Ζωρδάστρις ὁ μάγος. Here the Word δαίμων is put for a *wicked Being*, without any Adjective to determine its Sense. We may add here, that the learned Dr. *Hyde* considers *Arimanius*, as the *Devil*. Vid. *Hist. Relig. veterum Persar.* cap. 9. p. 162. So also Dr. *Prideaux*, *Connect.* Part 1st.

† Τί ὠφελιμώτατον; Θεός. Τί βλαβερώτατον; δαίμων.

Plut. in 7 *Sapient. Conviv.*

cients.

cients. “What is the most profitable Being?
 “God. What is the most mischievous? the
 “*Demon*.” Indeed he afterwards says, that
Thales * thought these Answers bold and dan-
 gerous. But we are not enquiring concerning
 the Truth of the Opinion, but the Use of the
 Word δαίμων, in an ill Sense, which he no more
 excepted against, than he did against that of
 Θεός in a good one.—In another Treatise, *Plu-*
tarch compares Persons in Debt, to those *De-*
mons of *Empedocles*, which, he says, were dri-
 ven by the Anger of the Gods, and fell from
 “Heaven.” † Than which we can’t wish for a
 clearer Description of the *Devil*, and his *An-*
gels, which are said to have been *cast out*, Rev.
 xii. 9, 10.—This reminds me of the Accounts
 the Poets give of the *Titans*, which I see no
 Reason why the *Enquirer* should not admit into
 the Number of his *Demons*, since *Homer* ex-
 pressly calls them *Gods*, and makes *Juno* swear
 by them ‡. But *Hesiod* represents them, as war-
 ring against *Jupiter*, and being overcome by
 him. Their Fate, he tells us, was to be cast
 down to *Tartarus*, and there bound with Chains||.
 So

* ἡ μὲν περὶ Θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων ἀπόκρισις θράσος ἔχει καὶ κίνδυνον.

Ibid.

† Πλάζονται, καθάπερ οἱ Τιτῆες, καὶ οὐρανοπεταῖς ἐκείνοι τῷ Ἐμπεδοκλέους δαίμονι,
 In lib. περὶ τῆ μὴ δανείζεσθαι.

‡ Ωμνυς δ’ ὡς ἐκέλευε, Θεὸς δ’ ὀνόματιν ἀπαντᾷς

τῶς ὑποταλαφίης, οἱ Τίητες καλέσονται.

Il. ξ. 279.

|| Καὶ τὰς μὲν ὑπὸ χθονὸς ἐντροδείης

Πίμπαν, καὶ δισμῶσιν ἐν ἀργαλείοισιν ἔδησαν, &c. Theogon. 718.

How nearly does this resemble that Passage in St. *Jude* v. 6. Δισμῶσις

So that there can be no doubt, whether they were good or ill Demons. — I may say the same of *Alecto*, whom *Virgil* calls a *Goddeſs**, who conſequently muſt be another of this Gentleman's Demons, and unqueſtionably a very noxious one. — To return to *Plutarch*. In his Book of the *ceaſing of Oracles*, after mentioning ſeveral idle, ſuperſtitious, and horrid Ceremonies, he ſays, “ I wou'd not affirm, that theſe are paid “ to any of the Gods, but rather that they are “ inſtituted to appeaſe and avert wicked Demons.” He inſtances in the Human Sacrifices, of which he has the following very remarkable Words. “ It is neither probable, that any of the Gods “ ever required, or accepted, them; nor that “ Kings, and Generals, ſhould, without any “ End or Reason, begin to ſacrifice their Children; but they did this, in order to avoid the “ Wrath, and to ſatisfy the Malice, of ſevere “ and cruel, curſed and bloody Demons†.” — My next Authority ſhall be, that of *Julius Pol- lux*, who expreſſly diſtinguiſhes Demons into

μοῖς αἰθέροις ὑπὸ ζέφου τητήρηκεν. Let us add here *Homer's* Deſcription of *Αττη*, that ſhe was caſt out of Heaven, and was hurtful to Men, II. T. 94. *Juſtin Martyr* ſays, ſhe was the ſame the Scripture calls the Devil, *Cohort. ad Græcos*.

* *Huic DEÆ cæruleis unum de crinibus anguem*

Conjicit. — *Æn.* 7. 346.

† — Θιῶν μὲν ἔδνι, δαιμόνων δὲ φαύλων, ἀποτροπῆς ἕνεκα φήσαιμ' αἰ τελεῖν μελιχία καὶ παραμύδια, καὶ τὰς πάλαι ποιημένας ἀνθρωποδοσίας ἔτι Θιὸς ἀπαλείψῃ ἢ προσδέχισθαι πιθανόν ἐστιν. ἔτε μάλιστα ἀνέχονται βασιλεῖς καὶ στρατηγοί, παῖδας αὐτῶν ἐπιδιδόντες καὶ ἀρχόμενοι καὶ φυλάττοντες, ἀλλὰ χαλιπῶν καὶ διερέπων ὄργας καὶ βαρυθυμίας ἀποσιέμενοι καὶ ἀπομπλάγις ἀλατῶν.

two Kinds; the one of which he calls ἀλεξίκακοι, the *Depellers of Evil*, and the other ἀλιτῆροι, *wicked*, or *pernicious**.—Lastly, we have in *Stobæus*, a large Citation from *Zaleucus*, who is thought the first of all the *Grecian* Lawgivers, who delivered his Laws in Writing†. It may be worth while to know the Sentiments of so very ancient and considerable a Person, on the present Subject. These we have very clearly in the following Passage: “Should any one be
“ tempted to Injustice by a *wicked Demon*—he
“ ought to beg the *Gods*, to assist him, in driving
“ him away ‡.”

FROM these several Extracts, we may gather, first, the great Confusion which appears in many of the ancient Heathens on this Point. They are so far from being fit Judges of the *Scripture* Sense of the Word δαιμόνιον, that scarce two, I had almost said, scarce any one of them, use it always in the same Sense. It stood alike for *Gods*, and *Men*, and for *Beings between both*, for the *alive* and *dead*, for the *good* and *bad*. So that, should I agree, that the *Scriptures* are to be interpreted according to them, we should be never the nearer a Conclusion. For I might still insist, and with as much Reason as this Gentleman can plead the contrary, that their Notion was that of *wicked*

* Οἱ δὲ δαίμονες, οἱ μὲν λύνοντες τὰς αἰσάς, ἀλεξίκακοι λέγονται——
οἱ δὲ κυρῶντες ἀλιτῆροι. Poll. V. 1. p. 546.

† Vid. *Fabric. Biblioth. Græc.* l. 2. c. 14.

‡ Ἐὰν δὲ τῷ παρασπῇ δαίμων κακὸς τρέπων πρὸς ἀδικίαν, — ἐκείνου τὰς τῆς Θεῶς συναπορέπειν αὐτὸν.—Apud *Stob.* Ed. 1609. p. 279.

Spirits; and therefore, that of these the *Scriptures* are to be understood. 2dly. As far as we can judge, in a Matter of such Uncertainty, the truest and oldest Notion of *Demons* seems to have been a corrupt Notion of *good* and *evil Spirits*, superior to Men. How they came by this, is not our present Enquiry. Tho' "it does not appear, that God made any such Revelation to the Heathen," *Farther Enquiry*, p. 40. yet they might have it originally, by the way of *Tradition*; *they might meet with it in some of the *Jewish Books*; and they might alter it, and dress it up in their own fabulous Way. Certain it is, that this seems to have been the most general Opinion of any. And I beg leave to remark, that even *Hesiod*, who is the Father of that Fancy, that *Demons* were *departed Souls*, does himself confine them to those of the *Golden Age*. If the candid Reader will indulge a Conjecture, I wou'd suppose, that even *he* designed to represent *good Angels*. But not knowing enough of their Nature and Original, he chose the Account he gives of them, as the most poetical. His Description, that they were the *Guardians of mortal Men*†, answers very nearly

* "It seems not improbable, as some Writers have observed, that some Tradition might then be spread, in the Eastern Parts of the World, of the Fall of the Angels, the Punishment of the Damned, and other sacred Truths, which were afterwards more fully explained, and taught by the Prophets, and Apostles. These *Homer* seems to allude to." — *Pope's Notes on the Iliad*, Book 8. v. 16.

† ———— *Δούλakes θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.* *Le Clerc* interprets *δαίμων* of *Angels*. *Quæ Angelum apud Græcos significat.*

Com. in *Gen.* cap. 3. v. 5.

E

the

the Character of those blessed Spirits. And accordingly, as this Gentleman has taken Notice, p. 9. it was the Opinion of *Philo*, that *Demons* and *Angels* were different Names for the same *Substencies**. — 3dly. It follows from what has been said, that a Charge on *Christians*, as cited above, is no less rash than injurious. Whether “ the Idea of *Devils*” be rightly “ substituted to the Word *Demons*,” or not, the *Christians* were not the first, nor the only Persons, who so considered these. They were regarded as *evil Spirits*, by some of the wisest Heathens; and this appears to have been as “ current a “ Doctrine” as any. And it may be worth considering, that the same *System of Demonology* not only prevailed among the *Jews*, but at present prevails all over the World, even in those Parts of it, which have not embraced *Christianity*. So that, if universal Consent can give

* Ψυχὰς ἔν, δαίμονας καὶ ἀγγέλους, ὀνόματα μὲν διαφέροντα, ἐν δὲ καὶ ταυτὸν ὑποκείμενον διανοηθεὶς, ἄχθος βαρύντατόν ἀποθήσθη διωσιδαιμονίαν. Ὡς περὶ δὲ ἀγαθῶν δαίμονων καὶ κακῶν λέγουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ, καὶ ψυχὰς ὁμοίως, οὕτω καὶ ἀγγέλους. — Here this Gentleman is pleased to stop; but that *Philo's* Sentiment may be clearly known, I shall take leave to add a Word or two more. — Οὐδὲ καὶ ἀγγέλους, τοὺς μὲν τῆς ἀγαθῆς προσήσεως — τοὺς δὲ ἑμπαλιν ἀνιέρους, καὶ ἀναξίους τῆς προσήσεως. — *De Gigantib.* Ed. Par. 1640. p. 286. As this Writer had observed before, “ that those, whom other Philosophers called *Demons*, *Moses* used to name *Angels*,” there can be no doubt, what, according to him, the *evil Demons* were. And tho’ he says of *Angels* good and bad, that they were ψυχὰς δὲ νισὶ κατὰ τὸν αἶρα πέλομεναι, p. 284. yet it is plain, that he did not mean *departed Souls*; since he there speaks of them as such, prior to any Entrance into Bodies. Ψυχὰς therefore seems here to signify *spiritual Substances* in general.

Credit to any Opinion, this bids fair to be believed. To prove this universal Consent, it would be easy to bring many Accounts of Travellers of the best Credit, asserting, that the unconverted Heathens still worship the *Devil*; that they pretend to converse with him, and to receive *Oracles* from him, and to be *afflicted* and *tormented* by him. But I shall wave this Task, as the Reader may see enough to the present Purpose, in Mr. Millar's *History of the Propagation of Christianity, &c.* and in Dr. Bekker's *Le Monde Enchanté*. From which last Author, as a Witness which may possibly be accepted, I shall content my self with producing the following Sentence. " All the *Pagans*, ancient
 " and modern, in *Europe, Asia, Africa*, and
 " *America, both North and South*, agree in
 " five principal Points, the Truth of which
 " can't be contested." The 2d and 3d of which are, " That there are *Spirits*, which had a Be-
 " ginning, and which are distinct from the
 " *Souls of Men*.—That these *Spirits* are either
 " *good* or *evil* ones; and that the one are the
 " Friends of Men, and the others their En-
 " mies*." — Lastly, the foregoing Account

* Tous les Païens donc anciens & modernes, Européens, Asiatiques, Africains, Américains Septentrionaux & Méridionaux, conviennent en cinq Points principaux, qui sont d'une Vérité incontestable.—2. Qu'il y a des Esprits, qui ont eu un Commencement, & qui sont distingués des Ames Humaines.—3. Que ces Esprits sont ou bons, ou mauvais; & que les uns sont Amis des Hommes, & les autres sont leur Ennemis.

Ed. *Amsterd.* 1694. Tom. 1. p. 133, 134. Vid. etiam p. 355.

will, I hope, be allowed to be a full and satisfactory Answer to the Periods we find, *Farther Enquiry*, p. 24. “ And hence we see, consistent with all Antiquity, the Origin of *Demons*, what they were, and how they came to be worshipped. They were *GHOSTS*, the *GHOSTS* of dead Men, and nothing else. They were not supposed to be *evil Spirits*, playing mischievous Tricks with Men; *evil Spirits*, of a distinct Order from human Souls; but the very *Ghosts* of Men unbodied; *GHOSTS* deified.” The Foundation of all this is a large Extract from Sir *Isaac Newton*, that great Genius, as this Gentleman very justly calls him. And indeed, his Name is enough to sink and terrify any Adversary: But my Comfort is, that I am dealing with one, who questions, whether any Names of great and good Men wou’d pass for Proof, in a Point of “ much the same “ Nature.” However, if Sir *Isaac* meant only to say, that *Ghosts* were deified, and that they were called *Demons*; I readily agree with him: But if he intended to draw the Consequence, which is drawn from him, I need say no more, to shew the Mistake. *Ghosts* might be called *Demons*, and yet it can’t be allowed, that *Demons*, in general, were *Ghosts*, and NOTHING ELSE*.

* Mr. Mede owns, that *Plutarch* and *Apuleius* acknowledged *Demons*, which never had entered into Bodies. These answer good *Angels*, p. 778. I add, so the Ancients did *evil Demons*. What do these answer?

THUS

THUS have I finished my Enquiry into the Heathen Sentiments of *Demons*: An Enquiry tedious, but yet necessary, to shew the little Grounds we have, to think them of such Consequence in this Case, or of such Use to our Adversaries. Having now conquered this Prejudice, let us consider the *Scriptures* themselves, and some truer Way of coming at the Sense of them.

THE Point in dispute is, what is the Meaning of *δαίμονιον*, in the *Sacred Writings*? Whether the *Souls* of departed Men, deified? Or, *Devils*, or *Idols*? To prove the former, this Gentleman begins, *Farther Enquiry*, p. 26. to consider the several Texts wherein this Word is mentioned. I will follow him, as far as the present Subject seems concerned.

OF *Psal. xcvi. 5. All the Gods of the Nations are Idols*; I before declared my Thoughts, *Essay*, p. 9. Nor has this Gentleman offered one Word to prove, that it does not relate to *material Idols*, or that it must relate to *departed Souls*. We have nothing here but mere Assertion; and I might say, in my turn, "I know not why
" this should be taken for granted." He indeed contends, that *δαίμονια* here can't signify *Devils*, nor did I ever say, that it did, *immediately*. However, I cannot but observe, that the Argument he proposes is very defective. They are, in the Original, *Vanities, Nothings*; "and it will be
" very hard to say, that they are *Nothings*, or
" have no *Power*, or are of no Consequence,
" while

“ while we suppose them to inflict Distempers, “ &c.” Not to insist, that this Difficulty is avoided, by understanding δαιμόνια, in this Place, of the mere Statues, or Idols*; I answer, that this is no Reason, why we should not translate them Devils. They may have some Existence, or some Power, and yet may properly be called Nothings, if “ considered,” to use his own Words, “ as not having that [Divine] Authority and Power, for which they “ were feared and revered.” They may be Objects of some sort of Fear, and yet not of any true, religious, and godly Fear. To this let us add the Testimony of Justin Martyr, as of one, a single Quotation from whom, with another from Josephus, this Gentleman “thought would have satisfied any one” what was “ the precise Meaning of the Word Demon.” Trypho had denied the Existence of evil and apostate Angels. The Father therefore, in order to prove this Point, produces several Texts of Scripture, the last of which is the very Text before us, Psalm xcvi. 5. † By his own Witness therefore

* And thus the Chaldee Paraphrase has understood the Word; as also Justin Martyr, who once cites this Place thus, οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἰδνῶν, νομιζόμενοι θεοὶ, εἰδὼλα δαιμονίων εἰσὶν, ἀλλ’ οὐ θεοὶ. Dial. cum Tryph. As Justin has, in this very Dialogue, more than once quoted this very Text rightly, the Citation above can be looked upon as no other than his own Explication.

† Vid. Just. Martyr, Ed. Genev. 1593. p. 238, 239. It may not be improper to add Van Dale’s Sentiments. Finding Fault with some Poets, who had used the Names of the Heathen Gods, he says, “ Ac non vident belli isti homines, tam ex ipsorum æque

therefore let us be tried, he himself being Judge. What Consequence cou'd there be drawn from this Text, to *Justin's* Purpose, if he had not believed the Word δαιμόνια to be equivalent to what the *Jew* denied, ἄγγελοι πονηρευσάμενοι καὶ ἀπόσταντες τῷ Θεῷ ?

WITH regard to *Deut.* xxxii. 17. there is but little Difficulty. This Gentleman has said but little, to set aside the common Opinion, and almost all the Translations which have been made. The Words are, *They sacrificed to Devils, and not to GOD; to Gods, whom they knew not, to new Gods, that came newly up, whom your Fathers feared not.* On this he first observes, *Farther Enquiry*, p. 30. “ *Demons* being put for “ *deified Persons*, answer exactly the Ideas of *new* “ *Gods, that came newly up.*” And do not also any other Objects of Idolatry, *whom their Fathers feared not*, as “ exactly answer the” same “ Ideas?” Suppose the *Devil* then first began to be worshipped among them, would not this Description equally fit him? Would he not have been a *new God to them*, tho', at the same time, he was truly a *Murderer from the Beginning.*

“ æque (quatenus Christiani sunt, aut videri volunt) quam ex com-
 “ muni Theologorum hypothefi, *Dii Gentium revera sint Dæmonia;*
 “ i. e. *Diaboli*, se ita ipsos invocare *Diabolos!* Spiritusque immun-
 “ dos tales, quales SALVATOR noster JESUS CHRISTUS ex verè
 “ obsessorum corporibus eiecit? DEI nempe, & humani generis
 “ hostes insensissimos, atque in æternum ab Ipso damnatos?”

Dedicat. de Orig. & Progres. Idolol.

THE

THE original Word for *Devils* here is $\square\text{ר}^{\text{ש}}$, derived from a Verb, which signifies to *destroy*. It cannot be denied, that *Destroyers* is a very proper Name for those *evil Spirits*: And accordingly, we find St. *John* himself calling the *Angel of the bottomless Pit*, Απαλλύων , which signifies the same. * It seems therefore, that the LXX rendering the Word by $\delta\alpha\iota\mu\acute{o}\nu\iota\alpha$, must be supposed to use this, in a *bad Sense*: And it appears something difficult to reconcile it to *departed Souls*, and to account for these being thought *Destroyers*. But we are told, p. 31. " it is well known, that $\text{ר}^{\text{ש}}$ signifies *powerful*, " and is applied to the Name of God, who is " *sufficient*. And why may not $\text{ר}^{\text{ש}}$ be derived " from, and signify the same thing, and mean " those *Demons*, whom the Nations around " looked upon as *powerful*, or *sufficient*?" It does not appear, that $\text{ר}^{\text{ש}}$ ever signifies to be *powerful* or *able*, in a *good Sense*; and therefore it is not likely it should give this Meaning to $\text{ר}^{\text{ש}}$, which is certainly derived from it. This is not so sure, with respect to $\text{ר}^{\text{ש}}$, which may as easily be deduced from ר , which signifies *Sufficiency* †. But however this be, it is unreasonable to think, that the Word $\text{ר}^{\text{ש}}$ signifies *powerful*, or *sufficient*, in this Place; not only, because we have no Instance of its signifying so in any other; not only, because there is none

* Rev. ix. 11.

† Vid. *Buxtorf. Lexic. sub utrisque radicibus.*

of the ancient Versions, which has so rendered it here *; but likewise, because it seems inconsistent with *Moses's* Design, which was to reproach and censure the heinous Ingratitude and Idolatry of the ancient *Israelites*. Whereas, the representing them as sacrificing to Beings whom *they looked upon and worshipped as powerful†*, would have been rather to have excused, or alleviated, their Guilt. Besides, can we think, that *Moses* intended to call the *Souls* of dead Men *powerful*? And yet, if this be the Purport of this Place, so *he* certainly did call them. And it is without any Authority or Warrant from the Text itself, to make him declare, not *his own* Opinion, but *theirs*.

I MIGHT pass over the eight next Pages of the *Farther Enquiry*, as being of very little Use to clear the Point contended for, and as containing only some very confused Remarks on four or five difficult Texts of the *Old Testament*, where the LXX, or *Vulgar Translations*, have *Demons*, or *Devils*, and “where there is no Foundation for any” such. And suppose we should grant this; all that could be gained from the Concession is, that those Versions were

* The *Chaldee Paraphrast* interprets it, as translated, *Dæmoniis*, in quibus non est utilitas. The *Samaritan Version*, *vilissimis*, both Expressions most opposite to *Power* or *Sufficiency*.

N. B. Mr. *Mede* translates the Word עֲרִיִם *Devils*, p. 744. as *Le Clerc* himself does, *Cacodæmonibus*.

Vid. *Waterl. Review*, p. 306.

† —Auroit-on eu tant de tort d'adorer ce qu'on croyoit estre animé d'une vertu divine, ou tout au moins, d'une vertu plus qu'humaine? &c. *Fontenelle-Hist. des Oracles*, p. 39.

here mistaken in the Sense of the Original. But the *Scripture* Notion of *Demons* would, notwithstanding, remain the same. Should we give up these Texts, we want not others, much more plain and certain ones, to shew this.—Nay, the Opinion of those Translators would be the same. It would be still true, that they looked upon δαιμόνια as *evil Spirits*. To make this plain, let us take a short View of some of these Texts. And,

FIRST, of *Psal.* xci. 6. instead of, *for the Destruction that wasteth at Noon-day*, the LXX read, ἀπὸ συμπλήματος καὶ δαιμονικῆς μεσημερίας. Whatever they read in the Original, or whatever was the Occasion of this Mistake; their Sense of *Demons* is no way affected. They plainly looked upon them, not as *departed Souls*, but as Beings, which might naturally cause Terror, and their Deliverance from which was owing to *Divine Providence*. I must not omit to observe, that in this very 32d Page, we have an admirable Specimen of the Excellency of interpreting *Scripture*, according to the Heathen Poets and Philosophers. “What this *Noon-day Demon* was, may be gathered,” as this Gentleman believes, “from what occurs in *Theocritus*, where the Goatherd refused to play on his Pipe at Noon, for fear of waking *Pan*, who was at that time of Day gone to rest. And it was a Maxim with *Pythagoras*, that *Heroes should be worshipped at Noon*.” The Reader will, I fear, be scarce able to forbear

bear smiling at the marvellous Consistency of these two Notions. Certainly it was judicious in them to chuse that time of Day for worshipping their *Heroes* or *Demons*, when they were gone to sleep.—And if it was to these, that the LXX really alluded, they too shewed their Wisdom, in making *Divine Providence* concerned in preserving good Men from such *very dangerous* Beings, as *departed Souls*, especially when *asleep*, must be imagined to be.

AGAIN, the Word we render *wild Beasts of the Desert*, *Is.* xxxiv. 14. the LXX and *Vulgate* interpret of *Demons*. We need not go about to vindicate them in this: We need not “gather from hence, as if the Sacred Writers talked of *Devils* and their Powers.” It is sufficient for us, what this Gentleman, p. 34. has granted, “that the LXX, not understanding the Words, expressed their Notion of something terrible, in order to raise the Idea of the Destruction spoken of by the Prophet.” If they did so, I hope it may be presumed, that they did not set down the Word *δαιμόνια* in this Place for *departed Souls*, and that they may be thought to understand by them Beings *very terrible*, or *evil Spirits*; which must be owned to “raise the Idea” still more.

EXACTLY the same may be said of *Isa.* xiii. 21. where the Word *דִּמּוֹן* is translated by *Demon*. The LXX might here not know the Meaning of the Original; and yet we may know *their* Meaning clearly enough. Nor is it pretended,

that they here point out to us *the Souls of dead Men*. The Cause of their Error, if they did err, I believe to have been this: The *Hebrew* Word being derived from a *Verb*, which implies *Horror*, they rendered it by Beings which were *most horrible*.—But really, the Word seems to be used in this Sense, *Lev. xvii. 7. They shall no more offer their Sacrifices to Devils*: which is much like *Deut. xxxii. 17.* considered before. This Gentleman thinks, “*Pan* is properly the *God* or *Demon* there intended.” But, in order to prove this, it will be absolutely necessary to shew first, that *Pan* was worshipped so early as *Moses’s* Time; which I apprehend to be a very difficult Task.

WHATEVER be the Sense of *If. lxv. 11*. I can’t think, that it “requires,” in this Place, “a particular Discussion.” It is confessed to be obscure: The *LXX* might be mistaken in the Sense of it. But, whether they were so or not, as I do not pretend to prove the Power of *Devils* from it, so neither can this Gentleman shew from hence, that the Translators here set down *δαίμονια*, for any *departed Soul*. In short, little can be collected from it, to our present Purpose, either way; and therefore I dismiss it.

HITHERTO then it has appeared, that in most of the Places, where the old Translators use the Word *Demon*, the Original denotes either *Destruction*, or *Horror*; but that in none of them, it can be justly thought to imply a *Ghost unbodied and deified*. We find therefore

no manner of Countenance for the new Scheme in the *Old Testament*. Δαιμόνιον there may keep its usual Signification : The Consequence of which is, that the *Gods of the Heathen* are there considered as *Idols*, or *Devils*.

WHICH Distinction I could wish were better remembred. It would prevent a good deal of Confusion on this Subject. They are the *Idols*, the *graven* or *molten Images*, the Unprofitableness or Insensibility of which the *Scripture* frequently describes. And it is not just, however common with some People, to apply these Descriptions to the Beings, to whom the Heathen Worship was *finally* directed; and to argue, that the *Devil* could be no Object of such *Worship*, because the Heathen Gods are represented in *Scripture* as *Nothings*, or worse than nothing. If the Reader will give himself the Trouble to examine p. 40 of the *Farther Enquiry*, with the References there made, he may see a little of this inconclusive Way of Reasoning.

IT is with Pleasure, that I come now to the *New Testament*, to “see the Meaning of the “Word *Demon* there.” I will consider every one of the Passages this Gentleman has produced, with some, which he has omitted. But I must beg to be excused, if I do not consider them in the same Order, in which he has placed them; intending to proceed gradually, and to follow an excellent Rule, which he himself had laid down in the *Enquiry*, which is to examine those Texts first which are most *plain* and *easy*,
in

in order to "make them the Standards and
"Tests, by which we ought to understand"
others.

FIRST, Demons are often in the *New Testament* called *Spirits*. * See *Matth.* viii. 16. *Luke* ix. 39. x. 20. — 2dly. *Evil Spirits*, *Luke* vii. 21. *Acts* xix. 12. are represented as having the same Power with those *Demons*, and as being ejected by our LORD, and in His Name. — 3dly. Another Name very frequently given them is *unclean Spirits*, *Mark* v. 2, 13. vii. 25, 26. *Luke* iv. 30. viii. 29. ix. 42, &c. And once, *Luke* iv. 33. such a one is called, *a Spirit of an unclean Demon*. — 4. Let us now enquire, who these *unclean Spirits* were. Some Help and

* To save the Readers the Trouble of turning to these several Texts, it may not be amiss to set them down here in the Margin.

πνεύματα. { They brought unto him many that were possessed with Devils: and he cast out the Spirits. —
Lo, a Spirit taketh him — the Devil threw him down.

{ Even the Devils are subject to us — In this re-
joyce not, that the Spirits are subject.

πνεύματα πονηρά. { He cured many of Infirmities and Plagues, and of
evil Spirits.

{ The Diseases departed from them, and the evil Spi-
rits went out of them.

{ There met him a Man with an unclean Spirit:
The unclean Spirits went out.

πνεύματα ἀκαθάρτα. { Whose young Daughter had an unclean Spirit: She
besought him, that he would cast forth the Devil
out of her Daughter.

{ — He commandeth the unclean Spirits, and they
come out.

{ The Devil threw him down — and JESUS rebuked
the unclean Spirit. —

Light may be got by comparing *Mark* iii. 22. with Verse 30. Here, *He hath Beelzebub*, and *He hath an unclean Spirit*, are equivalent Expressions: So are *unclean Spirits*, and *Spirits of Demons*, *Revel.* xvi. 13, 14. which are here said to have proceeded out of the Mouth of the Dragon; i. e. that old Serpent, which is the Devil and Satan, *Rev.* xx. 2. —5. This is the same with *Beelzebub*, the Prince of Demons, as our LORD's Reasoning with the Jews requires; when, on their ascribing these Miracles to *Beelzebub*, he asks, *how can Satan cast out Satan?* &c. whom he a little after compares to a strong Man armed—6. Like to this is the Language, *Luke* xiii. 16. where a *Spirit of Infirmary* is expressly ascribed to *Satan*. Both these last Texts were insisted upon in the *Essay*; and as no Reply has been made to the Reasoning on either, it may, I hope, be presumed, that they fully prove the Point for which they were produced.

FROM this short Collation of Passages it undeniably appears, that the Words *Demon*, *unclean Spirit*, *Beelzebub*, *Satan*, and the *Devil*, are, in the *New Testament*, used for the same Beings; which, I believe, will not all be pretended to be *departed Souls*. The *Jews*, not being able to deny our LORD's Dispossession, and yet resolved not to allow them, had nothing left but to ascribe them to the Power of *Beelzebub*, whom they called the *Prince of those Demons*. To shew the Absurdity of this Pretence,

tence, our LORD asks, *How can Satan cast out Satan?* Here he plainly calls the *Demons* who were *cast out*, as well as their *Prince*, by whom they were supposed to have been cast out, by the common Name of *Satan*: Otherwise it will be difficult to find any Force at all in the whole Argument. The Kingdom of *Satan*, and that of *Beelzebub*, are all along supposed to be the same, that *could not stand*, if once *divided against itself*. *Satan* therefore is here called *the Prince of the Demons**, and Possessions are strongly represented as his own Work, and as tending to support his Power and Dominion. This I look upon as decisive.

I AM called upon, *Farther Enquiry*, p. 53. to “ prove, that [the Devil and his Angels] “ have a Power over Mankind; and † exercise “ this Power so as to occasion *Diseases*; and “ that they were the real *Causes* of those Dis- “ orders mention’d in the Gospels.” All this, I apprehend, evidently follows from the Text considered. If *Satan* be *the Prince of Demons*, these may very properly be thought *his Angels*.

* So *Juslin Martyr* calls him, πᾶρ ἡμῶν μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἀρχηγέτης τῶν κακῶν δαιμόνων ὄφιν καλεῖται, καὶ σατανᾶς, καὶ διάβολος, ὡς καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων συγγραμμάτων ἐρευνήσαντες μαθεῖν δύνασθε· ὃν εἰς τὸ πῦρ πεμφθήσεσθαι μετὰ τῆς αὐτῆς στρατιᾶς καὶ τῶν ἐπομένων ἀνθρώπων κολασ- θησομένους τὸν ἀπέραντον αἰῶνα, προεμήνυσεν ὁ χριστός. *Apol.* 2. Here *wicked Demons* are expressly called the *Army of Satan*, or the *De- vil*; they are supposed to be the same with those our LORD stiled *his Angels*, and they are distinguished from *evil Men*.

† “ No Man can doubt, but *evil Spirits*, if they have any na- “ tural Powers at all, have Power to destroy Mens Bodies and “ Lives.” *Clarke’s Evidence of Natural and Revealed Religion*, 6th Edit. p. 228.

And

And we find CHRIST arguing, that they cou'd not, with any Sense, be thought to assist Him in curing those Disorders, because they were the *Causes* of them; and therefore this would be to defeat their own Design, and to undo their own Work.

LUKE xiii. 16. is another strong Proof of the same Truth. Here we have an Instance of a *Spirit of Infirmary*, a long terrible Disorder, being ascribed, not to *Demons*, but expressly to *Satan*. Surely then, we must own, he has some *Power over Mankind*, he then exercised this Power so as to occasion Diseases; and therefore 'tis not unreasonable to suppose him the *real Cause* of the other Disorders mentioned in the Gospels.

ANOTHER Text, which it will be proper to take a Review of, is, *Luke x. 18. I beheld Satan as Lightning fall from Heaven*. This Gentleman's Explication of which is as follows. *Farther Enquiry*, p. 63. "I see all Idolatry, or
 " the Worship of all other Gods besides the one
 " true God, will quickly be at an End. I see
 " the Kingdom of God will suddenly take place,
 " and that of Satan will soon fall from his
 " Height." The Reader is desired to take notice, that the WORSHIP OF OTHER GODS, is here represented as importing the same with the KINGDOM OF SATAN; and this is said to be the Sense of a Text of Scripture. But how it could be so, if the Scripture did not consider the Devils as assuming the Names of those Gods, and promoting their Worship, I must
 G own

own my self at a loss to understand. — *Magna est Veritas, & prævalebit.*

To return to the Text itself. We may allow the Paraphrase above given ; Still the Question will remain, what was it, which led our Blessed SAVIOUR to speak of this Overthrow of the Kingdom of *Satan*? Was it not the joyful Report of the *Seventy*, that *even the Demons* had been *subject* to them thro' His Name? If we understand these of Diseases only, the Answer does not appear *so pertinent, so close, or so natural*. It loses much of its Beauty and Force. Besides, when we remember, that our LORD, in other Places, clearly argues, that such Possessions were owing to the Power of *Satan*, and that such Cures were literally destroying it; we can't easily help understanding Him in the same Light here; not as taking occasion, from any Miracles wrought, to foretell the speedy ceasing of Idolatry, but, from a present visible Defeat of the Power and Malice of *Satan*, to describe, in a high and noble Figure, that more glorious and universal one, which wou'd soon happen.

WHILE we are considering the true Meaning of the *Demons* in the *New Testament*, it may not be amiss to see what this Gentleman has said upon the two Texts, which I mentioned as unconsidered by him in the *First Enquiry*. The first is *Luke iv. 35.* where, after our SAVIOUR had commanded a *Spirit of an unclean Demon* to come out of a Man, it is said, *when the Devil had thrown him in the midst, he came out of him,*

him, and HURT HIM NOT. The whole of this Language must be owned to be very strange, if applied either to a *departed Soul*, or to a *mere Epilepsy*. But I only observed, that the last Words point out some Being, who had Power to *hurt* the Man. *Vid. Essay*, p. 97. Otherwise they will scarce be consistent with St. *Luke's* wonted Accuracy. The Substance of the Answer to this we have, *Farther Enquiry*, p. 94. " Suppose the Man an *Epileptick*, and just " when our Saviour was curing him, or about " to cure him, that he fell in his Fit: or that he " suffered some great Convulsions in his Nerves " at that time.—Then every Word in the Evan- " gelist is fairly accounted for, without the " Supposition of a *real evil Spirit* afflicting the " Man." I cannot but think the contrary, and that for these two obvious Reasons. 1. Whereas this Account supposes the Man's Fit to happen, " when our Lord was curing him, or about " to cure him," the Evangelist expressly represents it, AFTER our LORD had spoken the healing Word. 2. As this miraculous Cure was instantaneous, 'tis very unreasonable to imagine, that there should have been any natural Fit, after the Command was given. Whereas, that the *Devil* should go out with Violence, is very agreeable to his Nature. I shall therefore now take the Liberty to repeat the Question which this Gentleman has cited out of my *Essay*, and which yet remains unanswered. " Can a Man " ever be *hurt* by the very Act of being cured,

G 2

" and

“ and much more, miraculously cured, of a
 “ common Distemper?”

THE other Text is, *Acts* x. 38. which contains St. Peter's Account of his LORD to Cornelius. *He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed with the Devil.* Here it is replied, p. 95. “ The Misfortune is, that there
 “ is not one Word of *Demons* in the Text; nor
 “ has it any Relation to the Subject of the En-
 “ quiry.” I answer, that if the Word *Demon* had been here instead of *Devil*, it would not have been so strong to my Purpose, as it is at present. The Word *Demon*, in that Case, would not have been allowed to explain it self. Whereas, if I can shew, that this Text relates to our LORD's *Dispossessions*, I believe it will be past all doubt, what the *New Testament Demons* were. In order to evince this, I must cite at large the 38, 39, and 40 Verses. *How GOD anointed JESUS of Nazareth with the HOLY GHOST, and with Power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the Devil, for GOD was with Him: And we are Witnesses of all things, which He did, both in the Land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem; whom they slew and hanged on a Tree: Him GOD raised up the third Day.* The Design of these Words is, I think, evident; to set before Cornelius, a short View of the *Life, Death, and Resurrection* of that LORD OF ALL, to whose Faith he had been supernaturally directed. The 38th Verse relates to his Conversation here upon Earth, and to the
 principal

principal of those many beneficial Miracles he then wrought by Divine Power. Of these the *Apostles* were properly *Witnesses*. And what other Miracles so well agree with this Description, as those of *healing the Demoniacks*, which in the Gospels are still represented as some of the Chief? — Every thing indeed, which our LORD said or did, tended to His great and final Conquest over the Enemy of Man's Salvation. However, this was not finished, but by His *Death*, not manifested even to the *Apostles* themselves, till after His *Resurrection*. And therefore it is not at all likely, that this should be intended in the Passage before us*, where the Cures mentioned are confined to the time of His *Ministry* upon Earth, and plainly distinguished from His *Death*, and *Resurrection*. Farther, if CHRIST's final Victory over the *Devil* had been here set forth, it is probable, that the Phraseology would have been different from what we find it at present, and that we should not have read διήλθεν -- *ιώμενος πάντας τὰς, κ. τ. λ.* but *ἵνα ἰάσῃται*: For this is pretty constantly the Stile of *Scripture*, where that Victory is spoken of. Thus, *Heb.* ii. 14. — *ἵνα διὰ τῆς θανάτου καταργήσῃ τὸν τοῦ κράτους ἔχοντα τῆς θανάτου, τῶν τετέστι, τὸν διάβολον.* Thus again, *1 John* iii. 8. *εἰς τὸ ἐφανερώθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα λύσῃ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου.* *Vid. etiam* *Verf. 5. & Tit. ii. 14.*

* The Words of *Grotius* on this Verse are worth our noting.
 “ Ideo à *Dæmonibus* corporaliter possessos liberavit, ut intelligeretur etiam genus humanum à *Diabolo* spiritualiter possessum liberaturus.”

HAVING

HAVING thus vindicated these Texts, I may now apply them to my present Purpose, and conclude from hence also, that the *Demons*, to whom the *Possessions* in the Gospels are attributed, were no other than *Devils*, noxious Spirits, apostate Angels.

AND if they are so to be understood in the Texts considered, it will lye on the *Enquirer*, tho' it be not easy for him, to assign a Reason, why we are not so to interpret the Word in others, or why we should imagine that the Sacred Writers had two different Senses or Meanings to it. They evidently speak of *Demons*, as synonymous to *Devils*. No Instance can be produced of their explaining the Word of *departed Souls*. This Sense then can never be admitted: The other ought always to be receiv'd, unless some peculiar Circumstance should be found in the Passage or Context to determine it to a different Signification. Of which Nature there appears but one, as will appear from a Consideration of the remaining Texts.

OF *James ii. 19. the Devils believe and tremble*, I shall say very little, the full Vindication of it being in a *Better Hand*. Thus much however I crave leave to add, that tho' the *evil Souls of departed Men* have reason to *believe and tremble*, yet the understanding *δαίμονια* here of these is, I believe, unprecedented, perfectly arbitrary, without any Necessity, Foundation, or Authority. What is here said of them can't be denied to be agreeable to the Nature of *Devils*: Supposing these,

these, the Apostle's Argument is rather strengthened; I do not remember any Passage in the old Heathen Writers, to warrant the other Interpretation*: Or, however, I think, I may affirm, what is of much more Consequence, that the *Scripture* will afford none. But I must do this Gentleman the Justice to say, that tho' he *proposes* this Interpretation, he does it with Submission to the Reader, (see p. 58.) and seems rather inclined to admit the common one. But if *δαίμόνια* has this common Sense here, it is reasonable to imagine, that it has the same in other Places. If it in this one Place signifies *Devils*, p. 48. why not in more? Why not in those Parts of the Gospels, where Diseases are ascribed to them? Tho' the Argument from *Probabilities* to *Facts* be disliked, the contrary, I hope, may be allowed to have some Force.

IN *Farther Enquiry*, p. 47. I find a Sentence, which affects the Reasoning of the *Essay*, and which therefore I think my self concerned to take notice of. "It was, I suppose, from this "Text," [that last considered] "that the Fathers said those things concerning Devils, "which occur so frequently in their Writings."

* It is a Satisfaction to me to find, that I agree in this with Mr. Mede, who observes, that "some of the latter Gentile Theologists thought, that the *Souls of wicked Men* became *mali Demones*; but the *Ancients* gave this Honour to the *Souls of virtuous Men only*," p. 777. N. B. The *Ancients* certainly had a Notion of *evil Demons*, as has been abundantly shewn above, tho' they did not dream of their being the *Souls of wicked Men*. And as for the *Jews*, they were far from any such Opinion. See *Bekker*, l. 1. c. 12.

A Reference is here made to the *Apologists*, who describe the Demons being tortured by the *Christians*. They then understood these *Demons* to be *Devils*: And I will hereafter consider the Force of their Authority and Consent. But it will be now proper to add, that it could not be “from this Text” only, “that they said those “things,” because they represent such *Tortures*, I will add, and *Dispossessions*, as Matters of frequent Experience. They trusted to their own Senses, in this Case: They appealed to those of their Enemies: They staked their Lives for the Truth of what they said. All this was shew’d at large by Extracts from the several Authors. To which we have no Reply, unless that above be allowed to be one. It seems plain, that this Author gives very little Credit to them; and it remains in doubt, whether he believes, that the primitive *Apologists* and *Martyrs* wanted common Sense, common Prudence, or common Honesty. For it is not to be supposed, that they had all these, if, in their Circumstances, they had not been perfectly assured of the Truth of what they wrote on this Point. See the *Essay*, p. 107—116.

LET US now consider 1 Cor. x. 20, 21. *Those Things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils, δαίμονις, and not to GOD, and I would not that ye should have Fellowship with Devils: Ye can’t drink the Cup of the LORD, and the Cup of Devils: Ye can’t be Partakers of the LORD’S Table, and of the Table of Devils.*
 These

These Words have so lately been the Subject of Dispute, and so well canvassed, that I need not say more than that the Sense, which the *Enquirer*, *Farther Enquiry*, p. 43. puts upon them, is by no means necessary, but is low and languid, and does not come up to St. *Paul's* Argument. His Design was to persuade the *Corinthians* to flee from *Idolatry*. And could he have a better Motive, than to shew them, that the Authors and Objects thereof were the most cruel and dangerous Beings in the Universe? Besides, in the 19 and 20 Verses, there is a plain Opposition between the *Idols* and *Demons*. The one he allows to be *nothing*; the other must therefore be owned to have some Power. But in what respect have *departed Souls* any, more than the *Images* themselves? I shall wave saying any more on this Subject, and rather refer to two late Authors, who are full and clear*.

A STRESS is laid upon Rev. ix. 20. *The rest of the Men, which were not killed by these Plagues, yet repented not of the Works of their Hands, that they should not worship Devils, and Idols of Gold and Silver, and Brass, and Stone, and of Wood, which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk.* This Gentleman, after Mr. Mede, imagines this spoken of the *Christian World*: And then asks,

* Vid. Waterland's *Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, ch. 8. *per totum*, and Warren's *Answer*, &c. Part 1. p. 83. *ad finem*. I can't but add, that this Gentleman would have done well to have confuted what these learned Persons have urged, before he had charged them, as he does in his Preface, with *Error and Negligence*.

“ Did ever any one charge the Christian World
 “ with the Worship of *Devils*? Or where are
 “ any *evil Spirits* made the Objects of Adoration
 “ among the Followers of *Jesus*? ” *Farther*
Enquiry, p. 47. I reply, 1. That, pretending
 to no Skill in expounding these Parts of the *Re-*
velations, I had nothing to do, but to look in-
 to some of the most learned Commentators :
 And the Consequence and Result of this Search
 was, that I found Mr. *Mede* not generally fol-
 lowed, in making the Text before us relate to
Christians. At least therefore I may say, that
 this should not have been taken for granted.
Grotius and Dr. *Hammond* think it accomplished
 about the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, and under-
 stand it of the *Jews*, to whom the *Doctor* adds
 the *Gnosticks* associated with them against the
Christians. *Zegerus* differs indeed from these,
 but expressly applies the Words to the *Gentiles*.
De Gentilibus loquitur. 2. Were it allow'd, that
 they relate to *Christians*, it would still be a
 Question, what is the true Meaning of *δαίμονια*
 here? Not *evil Spirits*, says our Author, because
 “ detestably corrupt as some Part of the Chri-
 “ stian Church is,” it can't be charged with
worshipping these. Granting this too, would
 it follow, that the Word must signify *departed*
Souls? By no means. *Grotius* understands it of
Money, &c. which the Men of *Jerusalem* were
 devoted to then, and made their *Idols*. *Drusius*
 thinks the Words *Demons* and *Idols* mean the
 same, and accordingly observes here, *hoc est,*
simulachra.

simulachra. Dr. Hammond seems to have been of the same Opinion, paraphrasing the Words, *and repented not of their Idol-Worship*. This Sense has some Countenance from the *Æthiopic Version*, where it is, *adoring Gods and Demons of Gold and Silver*. I will only add, that in one Copy, the Words *τὰ δαιμόνια ἔ* are omitted. This Copy is marked in Dr. Mill, *Pet. 3.* and of it he says, that with regard to the *Apocalypse*, “ tho’ it be now and then interpolated “ with marginal Explications, yet it, for the “ most part, gives us the true Text, often even “ in those Places, where it differs from our “ printed Copies.” * But, 3. Were it certain, both, that the Text under Consideration must be understood of the *Christian World*, and *Demons* here of *evil Spirits*; yet the Objection raised would have little Force. *Christians* need not be supposed to worship the *Devil*, *intentionally*, or *immediately*; and even this Charge is too bad to be laid on *all* the Heathens, tho’ it is certain many of them have deserved it: But this makes no Difference. The Question is not, what either design, or intend? But, who is the Father and Promoter of all Idolatry? Whose Kingdom is really maintained and kept up by it? To whom the Service and Honour at last

* “ In hac autem Novi Testamenti parte, cum explicationibus “ marginalibus hinc illic interpolatus sit, tum vero textum fere “ exhibet genuinum, etiam in iis haud raro locis, in quibus diversus abit ab impressis nostris.” *Proleg. N^o. 1455*

redounds? In this Sense, Mr. *Mede* owns, that the *Heathens* of old, and some *corrupt Christians* now, worship the *Devil*.

ST. *Paul's* Words, 1 *Tim.* iv. 1. This Gentleman, p. 45. passes over very slightly and hastily. He says, "I will not attempt to shew, that the Apostle is speaking of a Doctrine practised among *Christians*, viz. the Worship of dead Men, Saints, Saints Protectors, and not of Devils properly so called." I think him much in the right *not to attempt* a Task, which it would be hard to execute. However he asks, "Will not the Event, or what has passed, and does pass in the *Christian* World, sufficiently explain the Meaning? Read over any *Litany* in the *Mass-book*, and see how many *Demons* are invoked?" p. 46. &c. The Misfortune is, there is not one Word in the Text concerning *Invocation of Demons*: And if there were, yet some People might think arguing barely from the Event, to be a kind of Reasoning, the Consequences of which are never over readily to be admitted."—The Words of the *Apostle* are,—giving heed to seducing Spirits, and Doctrines of Devils—forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from Meats. Now to understand this of *Doctrines relating to departed Souls*, appears to be without any Foundation. The *Subjects* of the *Doctrines* are mentioned to be an unreasonable Abstinence from Marriage and Meats, without the least Intimation of invoking *Demons*, or addressing *Saints*. It can't be

be said to be *necessary* to understand the general Expression διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων in this way: Nor is it the best Sense: There are two or three others, which bid fairer for our Acceptance. Dr. *Hammond's* Paraphrase is, "tho' the Doctrines which they teach are most unclean, polluted, devilish Doctrines. *Erasmus* gives us two Interpretations, and seems much in doubt which to chuse. Not knowing how the Words *having their Conscience seared*, &c. could agree with *Devils*, he inclines at first to render δαιμονίων, *false Prophets*, or *Diviners*, who, as he says, *pretend to deal with Spirits*. However, he afterwards adds another Meaning, and answers his own Difficulty, in the following admirable, just, and full Explication. "There shall be some, who turning away from the Doctrine of the Gospel, shall hearken to false Doctrine, which *deceitful Demons* shall bring in by the means of Men, who insinuate their Lies under the Form of Godliness." * This Sense has the Patronage of St. *Jerom*, who observes upon the Place, that *all Heresy is framed by the Art of Demons*. † Nay, it is owned to be

a

* Δαιμονίων potest hoc loco adjectivum esse a δαιμόνιος, quod recte verti poterat *divinorum*, propter ea quæ sequuntur *cauteriatam*, &c. quæ in *Dæmonia* non quadrant, sed in *Divinos*, qui fingunt se cum spiritibus habere commercium: idcirco adjecit, *in simulatione falsiloquorum*—sin *Dæmoniorum* pro *Dæmonum*—sensus erit, *fore qui averfi à doctrinâ Evangelicâ auscultent falsæ doctrinæ, quam Dæmones fallaces invehent per homines, qui sub specie pietatis insinuant mendacia*. *Erasim.* in loc.

† Omnis hæretica doctrina dæmonum arte composita est. *Hieron.*

a true Sense even by Mr. Mede, to whom this Gentleman refers his Reader ; tho' that learned Person contended for another. His Words are as follow,—*Doctrines of Demons*, “ not which “ *Demons* or *Devils* are Authors of, THO' THIS “ BE TRUE.”—* Now I have mentioned this excellent and judicious Man; that the Weight of his Name may not be a Prejudice to the Argument I am maintaining, it may not be amiss to add; that tho' he took the opposite Side, and endeavour'd to prove, that the *Demons* here were to be understood, in the *Heathen* Sense, yet he was very far from being wholly of this Gentleman's Opinion, or from thinking, that *evil Spirits* had no Agency in this Affair, or were not called *Demons* in *Scripture*. I cited a strong Passage out of him, in the *Essay*, p. 14. Let us add one or two more. “ I take the Word δαιμόνιον not in that worst Sense, (which no Author BUT THE SCRIPTURE useth†.)” It is plain then, that he did not question the *Scripture* using it in the worst Sense. And the Reader may be pleased to remember, that some of the *Heathens* did not use it in a much better.—
 “ —The Use of the *Demon* in the worst “ Sense, or directly for a *Devil*, will be almost

ron. Com. in 1 Tim. iv. 1. In consonance with what Justin said of the heretical Teachers, they taught τὰ ἀπὸ τῶ ἀκαθάρτου πνεύματος διαδόχῃς ἐμβαλλόμενα ταῖς διανοίαις αὐτῶν, *Doctrines suggested to their Minds by the unclean Spirit, the Devil*. See also Beza and Fell on 1 Tim. iv. 1.

* Mede's Works, p. 771. Ed. 1664.

† Ibid.

“ confined

“ confined to the *Gospels*, where the Subject
 “ spoken of being *Men vexed with evil Spirits*,
 “ could admit no other Sense or Use*.” We see
 with what Caution Mr. *Mede* speaks, in the
 former Part of this Sentence, of the other Parts
 of *Scripture* ; and how absolutely of the *Gos-*
pels, in the latter. The Reader, I believe, will
 not desire any clearer Proof of the Sentiments
 of this truly great and learned Man.

THERE remains now but one Text to be con-
 sidered, which is *Acts* xvii. 18, and which I have
 reserved for the last; it being, I believe, the on-
 ly one in the *New Testament*, where the Word
δαίμονια is used in a good Sense. But neither
 will this answer the Purpose of the *Enquirer*.
 For is St. *Luke* here speaking his own Sense?
 'Tis evident, he is not. The Words were used
 by the *Epicureans* and *Stoicks*; and he, like a
 faithful Historian, only relates them speaking
 their own Language; which he ought to have
 done, whether he allowed such Language him-
 self or not. We are not therefore to seek the
Apostle's Meaning in the Words of the *Epicu-*
reans and *Stoicks*. This was well urged by Dr.
Warren†, and certainly deserved the Gentle-
 man's Notice. — But farther, as I own that
δαίμονια, in this Passage, does not signify *Devils*,
 so, I think it hard to prove, that it signifies the
Souls of departed Men: Yes, says this Gentle-
 man, following Mr. *Mede*, “ he preached to

* Page 784.

† *Answer to plain Account*, Part 2. p. 7, 8.

“ them

“ them *Jesus*, and that God had *raised him*
 “ *from the dead*, and therefore the Word *De-*
 “ *mon* here is used for the Soul of one deceased,
 “ or of a Man *raised from the dead*.” Now
 admitting that the *Resurrection*, in this Place,
 means that of the LORD JESUS; tho’ there is no
 Necessity we should so understand it, the 31st
 Verse being Part of a future Sermon, and there-
 fore not *certainly* explanatory of the *Resurrection*
 in the 18th; but, I say, admitting this, we
 have here a *new* Sense of the Word *δαιμόνιον*.
 For are *departed Souls*, and *Souls of Men raised*
from the dead, and consequently reunited to their
 Bodies, the *same*, and *equally Demons*? The
 Point to be proved was, that *δαιμόνιον* “ is used
 “ for the Soul of one deceased.” In order to
 this, an Instance is produced, which relates to
 a *living Man*, both *Soul and Body*. The Word
Demons therefore was neither used here for *De-*
vils, nor *Souls departed*, but for *Gods*, or *Deities*
 in general. In like manner, as *Socrates* was ac-
 cused, as ἕτερά ἢ καὶ αἰνὰ δαιμόνια εἰσηγόμενος*,
 without being charged, that ever I read, with
 recommending the Worship of any *new deceased*
Person.

THE Gentleman, in his first *Enquiry*, p. 4.
 having made *Josephus* and *Justin Martyr* speak
 for *Jews* and *Christians*, with regard to *Demons*;
 I offered a Reason to account for their Language’s
 being different from that of other *Jews* and
Christians. See *Essay*, p. 9. This, in *Farther*

* *Laertius apud Grotium.*

Enquiry, p. 48. is called a *groundless Assertion*. The Sentence relating to *Josephus* is this, "What Wonder can it be—that he, to recommend his Histories to the Heathens, for whose sake he wrote them, should *probably* have adopted one of their Mistakes, and given an Explanation of the Word *δαίμωνιον*, which they had been used to?" The Reader may perceive by the Word *probably*, that I expressed myself with some Reserve and Caution. But this Word the *Farther Enquiry* leaves out of the Citation, I hope with no Intention of representing me as *asserting*, that the Case *really was* so; whereas the utmost, which can be collected from my Words, is, that *it probably might have been* so. However, *Van Dale* makes no Scruple to charge *Josephus* home, and directly accuses him in Terms which may deserve the Reader's Notice; as he was a great Enemy to the common Notions of *wicked Spirits*. "So far does this Man, a Priest of the *Jews*, in pretence, but *half a Pagan*, in reality, continually study to flatter the *Romans* and *Greeks*, that he applies [N. B.] both the Sense and Words of the *Holy Scriptures* themselves, to the Superstitions and Ways of speaking, which prevailed among the *Gentiles* *.

* —in tantum hic vere semipaganus (prætenſus tamen ſacerdos Judæorum) ſemper adulari Romanis ac Græcis nititur, ut ipſius S. Scripturæ & ſenſus & verba Gentilium ſuperſtitionibus, ac loquendi modis & formulis accomodet. *Van Dale de Orig. & Progreſſ. Idolol.* p. 77.

As to *Justin Martyr*, I supposed, he then spake according to the Notions he learned among the *Platonists*. I shall not stay to justify this; because, as *Bekker* has truly observ'd, "there is
 " a great Uncertainty in what *Plato* and others
 " have wrote on these Matters, and they differ
 " from each other, and even from themselves."
 * Besides we have seen, that *Justin*, elsewhere, plainly supposes the *Scripture Demons* to be *evil and apostate Angels*, and the *Devil* to be their *Leader*: And therefore if he declares a different Meaning of *his own*, in the Passages, which are cited from him, he not only stands single, and differs from other *Fathers*, but is inconsistent with himself †.

I BELIEVE, I need not take the Pains to prove, that the rest of the *antient Christian Writers* understood the *Demons* of *Scripture* to be *Devils*. The *Enquirer* has made no Claim to any of them. And I believe, there are few Points, in which they agree more entirely. Let us therefore consider the Force of their Consent, and whether they may not properly be called in, as good Interpreters of *Scripture*? For my own

* ——— tant il y a d'Incertitude en ce que Platon & les autres en ont écrit, & tant ils sont opposés entre eux, & à eux—memes.

Le Monde enchanté, Tom. 1. p. 22. *Vid. etiam* p. 26.

† To confirm this, I can't forbear adding one Passage out of his *first Apology*, where he says our SAVIOUR was made Man, ὑπὲρ τῶν πεινόντων ἀνθρώπων, καὶ καὶ ἀλλύσει τῶν δαιμόνων, *for the sake of Believers, and to destroy the Demons*. Can he be understood here to speak of *departed Souls*? Can we doubt of his meaning the *Devils*? Especially when, in the very next Words, he mentions the frequent *Dispossessions* then caused by the *Christians*.

Part,

Part, I can't but think they were much more likely to explain these rightly, together with the Doctrines for which some of them laid down their Lives, than either the *antient Heathens*, or *modern Christians*, who despise their Assistance. If they were in some things mistaken; so were those, so may we be. This ought not to set aside their Credit, unless they pretended to *Divine Authority*. Where they all agree, we have the strongest Presumption of Truth, much the same Evidence, which we have for the Genuineness of the Books of *Scripture*. A *Christian* therefore, who receives these on their Testimony, should not, methinks, be inclined to reject an Interpretation, which has their Concurrence, much less to advance another, in opposition to them.—Besides here, in the Point before us, is one remarkable Circumstance in their favour. If their own Accounts were true, it was not possible for them to have been mistaken in the Meaning of the *Scripture Demons*. I must again refer to my *Essay* for Proof, how fully they appealed to the frequent *Dispossession*s then wrought by *Christians*; how positively they asserted, that the *Demons* betray'd and confessed their true Nature; and how worthy of Credit their Evidence is, in the present Point.

WE have now gone through the chief Part of the *Farther Enquiry*, which relates to the *Essay*, and which required to be considered at large, being almost all *new Matter*. The Result of all is, that the *Scripture Demons* are properly

perly *Devils*, and that there is no Reason, from any Part of the *New Testament*, to think, that the inspired Penmen thereof understood the Word in any other Sense. The Consequence of which is, that the *Demoniacks* in the *Gospel* were Persons properly *possessed*, and that their Disorders were imputed to the *Devil*.

PROCEED we now to vindicate those Passages in the *Essay*, which are excepted against, or animadverted upon, in the *Farther Enquiry*. The first we meet with, p. 65. " If there had
" been no *Possessions*, 'tis unaccountable whence
" the general Belief of them arose : And if
" there had been no such general Belief, we
" can never imagine, that those *Charms* wou'd
" have been invented, or have been used," viz. *as were in Practice among the Jews*. In answer to this, the Gentleman thinks it " probable, that
" an Inability to account for certain Symptoms
" by any natural means, was the Reason from
" whence the *general Belief of Possession* might
" arise." But surely this could not be the Case with regard to *Madness*. They were at no loss to account for the Symptoms of this. Thus, when *David* counterfeited *Madness*, to escape out of the Hands of *Achish*, we do not find they were ignorant of the Disorder : They had no Recourse to *Spirits* : They did not believe any *Possession* *. You see, said *Achish* to his
Servants,

* It is remarkable, that the *Seventy* make *Achish* call *David* an *Epileptick*, and describe him in Words much alike those in the *Gospel*,

Servants, *the Man is mad* — *Have I need of Madmen?* &c.*

WHAT follows in the 66th Page, relates wholly to the *Heathens*, and has been considered in the foregoing Sheets. I shall therefore add only, that it is nothing to the present Argument, which is concerning the *Jews* only, who neither thought “the *Air*, nor the *World*, “to be full of *Souls*,” and who certainly believed the Doctrine of *evil Spirits*.

As to the Business of *Charms*, I imagined, they were founded on the *Belief of Possessions*, and owed their Original to it. I spoke not only my own Sense, but that of Dr. *Freind* and *Grotius*. My Reason still is, that *Charms* seem to have a nearer Relation to *supernatural Inflictions*, than to such as are *natural*. If the Reader should think that this wants weight, I must leave it to his Candour. The general Argument is little affected by it. And it is true notwithstanding, that those *Charms* which were in use among the *Jews* to drive out *Devils*, suppose a Belief of *Possessions*. This was all I insisted upon in this Part of the *Essay*.

Gospel, *be swallowed foaming*. Ἐπιπλεῖ ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας τῆς πύλης, καὶ παλιέρι τὰ σίλα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν πώγωνα αὐτοῦ ——— ἴδετε ἄνθρωπον ἐπίληπτον. ——— This is a certain Proof, that the *Epilepsy*, as well as *Madness*, were known and called by their proper Names, at the time this Translation was made; and that they did not generally believe these to be *Possessions*, from any Inability to account for them. And indeed, 'tis my Opinion, that a general Belief has commonly some better Foundation.

* 1 Sam. xxi. 13, 14, 15.

“ BUT

“BUT Charms were applied to infinite other
 “ Cases; as well to secure Men from Misfor-
 “ tunes, as to drive out *Demons*,” *Farther En-*
quiry, p. 67. This I never denied: Nay, in
 a Note, *Essay*, p. 20, 21. I expressly obviated
 the Objection, and answered in the Words of
Grotius, *à dæmonibus ad morbos mos transiit*. To
 which no Reply has been vouchsafed.

IN order to shew that *Possessions* are only In-
 stances of *Madness*, the *Enquirer*, p. 36. had ci-
 ted *John* x. 20. *He bath a Devil, and is mad*.
 Among other Answers yet unconsidered, I ob-
 served, *Essay*, p. 41. that “ *Madness* may be
 “ here represented as one Attendant, or Sign,
 “ or Effect of such *Possession*; but it will not
 “ therefore follow, that it was the whole of it.
 “ Both sacred and profane Writers speak of
 “ *Madness* very frequently, without the least
 “ Intimation of a *Demon*; which shews, that,
 “ as such, it was looked upon as a *common Dis-*
 “ *order*, and nothing more.” To which we
 have a Reply, *Farther Enquiry*, p. 69, 70, 71.
 which being pretty long, I shall abridge. That
 not all kinds of *Madmen*, but “such as were
 “ much troubled with the *atra bilis*, were
 “ deemed possessed;” that this Sort was impu-
 ted by *Plautus* to the *Larvæ*; that it was im-
 puted as well “to *Demons*, as to a *natural*
 “ *Cause*;” That, “as *Hippocrates* has shewn, that
 “ no *Demon* was concerned in any Degree” of
 the *Epilepsy*, so “in the several Species of *Mad-*
 “ *ness* amongst the *Larvati*, *Cerriti*, *Lympha-*
 “ *tici*,

" *tici*, the Case was much the same." Now, first, I know not on what Grounds this Gentleman supposes, that the only Species of *Madness* imputed to *Demons*, was "an Alienation of Mind without any Fever, which arose from Melancholy, or black Choler." Whether any other was imputed to the *Larvæ*, or not; it seems to me, that some of the *Demoniacks* in the *Gospel* were of another Sort. They are represented, not as in a *melancholy*, but in the most *raging* Way, breaking their *Chains*, *raging*, *wallowing*, and *foaming*. And tho' the *Jews* charged our BLESSED LORD with *having a Devil*, yet he was so far from being *melancholy*, that he is represented as *coming eating, and drinking*, as frequently mixing in publick Assemblies, and as being present at Festival Entertainments.

BUT, 2^{dly}, Should we allow this Distinction, yet it would not serve the Gentleman's Purpose, unless he could prove, that when *Madness* is mention'd, without the least Intimation of a *Demon*, it is always some other Species of *Madness*, and never that which proceeded from *atra bilis*. But he himself allows, that even this "was imputed, as well to *Demons*, as to a "natural Cause." And it is by no means true, that *Melancholy, as such*, was constantly ascribed to a *Demon*. I conclude therefore that *Madness*, this as well as other Sorts, was looked upon as a *common Disorder*, and not believed to be the whole of a *Possession*.

THIRDLY,

THIRDLY, I observed in the *Essay*, p. 15, that *Hippocrates* had good Reason to say of the *Epilepsy*, in general, that it was τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, naturally incident to Man. We need not dispute, whether the Case of the *Larvati*, &c. was the same; tho' I considered them before. The Case of the *Demoniacks* in the *New Testament* is far different. We have seen what the true Notion of *Demons* here is. They are Beings, whose *Power* and *Malice* are sufficiently set forth therein. We have therefore no Reason to think this a *bare Hypothesis*.

As Instances of the Power of *evil Spirits* among the antient *Heathens*, I insisted on their *Oracles*, *Essay*, p. 21, &c. and shew'd, from *Justin Martyr*, *St. Cyprian*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, *Eusebius*, and *St. Augustine*, that they were looked upon, in the *primitive Church*, as *diabolical*. But the Sense of *this*, I find, is not worth considering. "The Fathers * *invented* a " new Scheme of Demonology, in order to account for certain Phænomena."—And "as clear as" I "may imagine this to be," the "Gentleman makes no Scruple to say, that this "is a mere Hypothesis, in order to account for "what may otherwise be accounted for." *Farther Enquiry*, p. 72. This is easily said; but

* As no particular *Fathers* are named in this Censure, nor any time set down, when this *new Scheme* is supposed to have been *invented*; I can't but think the *whole primitive Church* injured, if not struck at, in this cruel Reflection: which surely therefore can scarce be read without *Surprize* and *Indignation*.

as it is not enforced by any one Reason, the Reader will not expect me to shew at present, that this is *not* "a mere Hypothesis," and that the Facts *cannot* "be otherwise accounted for." *Affirmanti incumbit probatio.* — As the Case stands now, the Reader is to chuse, whether he will credit the Assertion of this Gentleman, or the joint Testimony of all those Writers, concerning what happened *in their several Ages*, and what some of them speak of, as Matters of frequent Experience*.

I COME now to vindicate *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and his Account of *Plato's* Sentiment, that "the *Demoniacks* do not speak their own Language, but that of the *Demons* who were "enter'd into them." And can this Gentleman deny, that *Clemens* has said so? No, he does not. But he tells us, that he has "been "long accusom'd to doubt of such Assertions." p. 72. He does not sure mean, to doubt of the Truth of Citations in general. The learned World has been long obliged to *Eusebius*,

* *Porphyry* was, in this Matter, of the same Opinion with the *Fathers*. *Van Dale* tells us of him,—"certè—nullatenus dubitat de auctoribus *prædictionum, vaticiniorum, atque oraculorum*, omnisque *consiliorum seu præfigiarum*: quæ cuncta sine ullâ hæsitazione *malignis* adscribit *Dæmonibus*, &c." *de Orig. & Progress. Idol.* p. 47.

N. B. The Reader may see *Porphyry's* Testimony, as well as the Sentiments of the *Fathers*, concerning *Oracles*, admirably vindicated against *Van Dale*, *Fontenelle*, *Le Clerc*, *Bayle*, &c. in a Book, which I have very lately had the Pleasure of reading; *An Answer to Mr. de Fontenelle's History of Oracles. Translated from the French.* Lond. 1709.

Stobæus, and others, for preserving some valuable Extracts from Authors, which have been since lost. Nor has the Authority of these been lightly questioned. So that I must understand this Gentleman to speak of *Clemens only*: And accordingly he adds, p. 73. "Whoever will
 " exactly examine what he quotes, as I have
 " done in several Instances, he will find strange
 " sorts of Evidences produced for what he says,
 " from Authors, who never meant what he has
 " produced them for." But, as he has not given us any one Instance of this *, I cannot say any thing to so general an Accusation. I must however observe, that if he has dealt by other Instances, as he has by this, we have not any great Reason to think the worse of *Clemens's* Judgment and Veracity. He thinks, that the Place alluded to is one he has produced out of *Plato's Io*, which he owns, p. 74. "does not so
 " much as mention *Demoniacks*." I need not claim the Benefit of his allowing *Clemens* to be *certainly a Man of Learning*. Plain common Sense would have secured one from so idle and weak a Blunder. The Mistake therefore is here more probably belonging to the *Enquirer*, than to the *Father*.—But he desires us to shew the Place in *Plato* alluded to. How unfair is this!

* Suppose this to be true, in one Case, are we to doubt of all other Citations, which we cannot presently turn to? The Readers may remember, that *Ocellus Lucanus* was quoted, not long since, to prove what he never thought of. But, it is hoped, they will be more candid than, from this Instance of Negligence, to suspect the Truth of the other Authorities appealed to in the same Piece.

Clemens

Clemens does not name the particular Treatise, from which he cited: He might cite from one which is now lost. If *Plato* has escaped all Injuries of time, he has had better Fortune than most others of the Ancients*. At least then, I may say, that this is a more likely Supposition, than that *Clemens* should quote at random what had no manner of Relation to his Subject; nay, where he had not so much as *the Sound of Words* to follow.

WHEREAS I had said, that “σεληνιαζόμενος is
“ used for all Distempers, on which the *Moon*
“ has any Influence,” I am answered, “ were it
“ used for *only* such, I should think it no hard
“ Matter to prove, that it extended to none at
“ all.” *Farther Enquiry*, p. 75. I am unwilling
to debate foreign Points: And if I had said,
“ on which the Moon *was supposed to have* any
“ Influence,” the Argument of the *Essay* would
have been exactly the same; as the Reader may
see, by consulting p. 49. The Case of *Demoni-*
acks will still be different. This “Name is” *not*
“ derived from a *supposed* Cause, without any
“ Foundation or Ground.” This the Gentleman
should have proved, but has not.

* *Fabricius* has remarked, in his Account of the Works of *Plato* which are lost, that that Saying of his, *Deum αὐτὸν γεωμετρεῖν*, is not at present found in his Works. *Biblioth. Græc.* l. 3. p. 31. *Plutarch* had observed the same; and yet, tho’ it was not expressly in any of his Writings then extant, he grants, that it was *Plato’s*, ἔχον δὲ πίσιν ἰκανὴν, καὶ τῷ Πλατωνικῷ χαρακτῆρὶ ἐστίν. *Sympos.* l. 8. qu. 2.

THE Case of the *Epileptick* I considered at large, *Essay*, p. 49—56. to all which we have little or nothing replied. I answered the several Objections he made against the *Literal Sense*; which Answers yet stand good, he having not attempted to disprove them. And sure, *received Opinions* are fully vindicated, when what is objected to them is fairly answered. Persons in Possession need not be ever proving their Title. Yet this is made an Exception against me. The Gentleman asks, “how is this [Case] proved to “be more than natural? Why, by insisting on “the *Letter*, without having first proved, that “*Devils* are permitted to have such Powers over Men.” But is not the *Letter* to be *insisted on*, when the Difficulties alledged against it are shewn to be of no Consequence? No good Critick or Expofitor will lightly depart from the *Letter of Scripture*. They must be *real and strong* Objections, which will warrant this. As I had shewn those, which the Gentleman raised, not to be such, I hope, I had good Reason to adhere to the *Letter*; and to conclude, that this it self sufficiently proved, that “*Devils* “were permitted to have such Powers over “Men.” How otherwise, I beg to know, would he have had me to prove it? From Reason? I shall never attempt it. I fear, we know not enough of the *invisible World* from hence, to arrive at any Certainty. I am therefore, in the present Argument, confined to *Scripture*. But how could I prove the Point from *Scripture*,

ture, otherwise than by insisting on the *Letter* of some Part of it? And if of *some* Part of it, why not of the Part then vindicated? It was not therefore necessary, that I should antecedently prove a Point, by other Texts, which the present Text, when the Difficulties were solved, was itself a sufficient Proof of.

HOWEVER, if there was any Defect in this *Essay*, it is, I hope, abundantly supplied in this *Reply*. In which, by a Review of the several Passages relating to *Demons*, I have endeavoured to shew, that they are *Devils*, which have *Power over Men*. And therefore the *Power, Existence, or Influence of Devils* may be concluded from the very Place before us. It is indeed insinuated, p. 76. that *Demoniacks* was only a *Technical Term*, like *St. Anthony's Fire*. This Parallel is a favourite one; it was before produced; we shall find it again anon; but sure, it is far from being exact. I have this Gentleman's Word, p. 54. that no body "imagines *this* to proceed "from *that Saint*." Whereas the *Jews* firmly believed *evil Spirits* to be the real Cause of the other Disorders.—We have no ground to think, that *St. Anthony* has any *such Power*: Whereas the *Scripture* speaks plainly of the *Power of Satan*, and the Malice of the *Devil*.—*St. Anthony's Fire* is a bare Name for a particular Disease: Nor do we ever hear of him, any thing like what we read in the *New Testament* of *Demons*, that they are spoken to, and expostulated with, that they confess our LORD, and talk

talk to Him, that they are cast out, and afterwards enter into, and act upon, other Beings. All this surely implies something more than a mere *technical Term*.

THIS leads us to consider the *Legion*, against the literal Sense of which this Gentleman has mustered up nine *Difficulties*. All of them do not relate to me: Such as do, I will now view. 1. "It supposes a Man drove of the *Devil* into the Wilderness—but presently we find a *Legion of Devils* in him." This was observed before, and answered, *Essay*, p. 59. I add, that this Difficulty is levelled directly at the *Evangelists*. Howsoever they are to be understood, they plainly use this Language. Neither will the Scheme of the *Enquiry* clear them: Since not only in the Names of the *Possess'd*, but in *their own Names*, they speak both in the *Singular* and *Plural*. But really, I cannot think this any great Fault: I yet think, such Variations may be found in the best Writers. It is thought "impossible to produce a similar Instance," *Farther Enquiry*, p. 78. I had referred to *Deut.* 12. But no Notice is taken of this, nor has the Gentleman been so good as to tell us, whether he has consulted the Place or not. But "6600 Men may make up one *Army*, one *Assembly*, but never one *Man*. In the same manner, 6600 Devils can never be called *one unclean Spirit*, as it plainly is in the *Evangelists*." While Men are charging *inspired Writers* with Inaccuracies, they should at least be

be careful to be accurate themselves. But here the Word *ONE* is added, and printed in *Italicks*, as the *Evangelists*; tho' I can't find it in either of them. Neither do they ever *plainly* call "6600 Devils---one unclean Spirit." All that can be said is, they sometimes speak of the *whole Body of them collectively*, in the singular Number, and sometimes, *distinctly*, in the Plural. In like manner, as God, speaking to His People *Israel*, said, *Deut. xii. 1. These are the Statutes and Judgments which YE shall observe to do, in the Land which the LORD GOD of THY Fathers giveth THEE, &c.* It might as well be pretended, that this Passage is not to be understood literally, because the whole Army of *Israel* could not be represented as *one Man*.

THE third Difficulty is, "is it at all *probable*, " that this Petition should proceed from *evil* " *Spirits*, that they might enter the Swine?" I have shewn the *Scripture Demons* to be no other than *evil Spirits*. It is *certain*, if *Scripture* is to be believed, that these *Demons* did make this *Petition*. And, I presume, *Inspired Writers* understood their Nature better than my self, or even, than the *Enquirer*. ——— Let us however hear his Reason. " *Moral Evils* they may desire to do, but why *natural Evils*, which " tend not to promote their Dominion, Power, " or Influence." I ask, why they should desire to do *moral Evils*? Is it not, to gratify an envious, malicious Disposition, and to hurt and destroy Mankind? Is not this the Character the
Scriptures

Scriptures assign to them? And will not the same Motives prompt them to do *natural Evils* also? Is there any thing *improbable* in supposing Beings to be * willing to do *smaller* Injuries, who continually study and delight to do the *greatest*?

DIFFICULTY the 4th, “ Why did Devils “ *worship* Jesus?—Or how came they to know “ him to be *the Christ*?—Was it from God or “ Man?” We need not trouble ourselves much about such Questions as these: Could we not answer them, we might very *safely* remain in Ignorance, and believe nevertheless the *literal* Sense of the *Gospels*. Should I say, they had *heard the Fame of* JESUS, this Gentleman could not justly except against the Supposition: Or, should I say, they acknowledged and worshipped our LORD, out of fear of being punished, or by Constraint of *Superior Power*, he would find it difficult to confute me.

AGAINST this the next Difficulty is designed to ward. “ Is it conceivable to be suitable to “ their Nature and Disposition, and their *Know-* “ *ledge*, to desire, even in the *Presence* of their “ *Judge* and Avenger, to do Mischief? Is there “ so much *Folly* as well as *Wickedness* in these “ subtle Beings?” p. 80. But do they not know, that they are *always* in the *Sight* and *Presence* of their JUDGE and *Avenger*? Do they not know that their Doom is fixed? Are they not in a State

* Dr. Bekker allows, as what *all* should affirm, that the *Devil*, if he had *Power*, has *Inclination* enough to do all the Evil that is attributed to him. See *Tom.* 3. p. 354.

of Reprobation and Despair? And yet, do they not always, and that for this very Reason, because they are so, desire and labour to do as much Mischief as they can? As great then as the *Folly* is, we are sure, that the *Presence* of their *Judge* and *Avenger* does not restrain them.

“ SIXTHLY, In the literal Interpretation, our
 “ Lord gives them leave, nay *bids* them go into
 “ the Swine. By this he seems to make him-
 “ self *Partaker* in their Mischief, in destroying
 “ 2000 Head of Swine.—Nor do I think the
 “ Attempts to solve this, given by learned Men,
 “ at all remove the Difficulty: Nor is it like
 “ any thing in our Saviour’s whole Character
 “ besides.” I wish the *Christian* Reader may
 be inclined to make proper Allowances. He
 might otherwise express some Resentment a-
 gainst a Man, who, to support a novel Inter-
 pretation, is content to join the Cry of the *In-*
fidels, and to lick up the Spittle of *Woolston*. I
 shall only mention the Answer of *one* very *learn-*
ed Man, which appears to me to be perfectly
 satisfactory—“ The Part which JESUS had in
 “ their Destruction, does not appear to be such,
 “ as made Him either principal or accessory:
 “ It is said indeed by St. *Mark*, that *He* gave
 “ *them* leave, but by St. *Luke* only, that *He* *suf-*
 “ *fered* the Devils to enter into them. By which
 “ may be meant no more, than that He did not
 “ prevent them, that He did not interpose His
 “ Divine Power, by which He might have hin-

L

“ dered

“ dered them from entering: For this Expla-
 “ nation may be justified by other Passages of
 “ the *Old and New Testament*, as *Grotius* has
 “ fully shewn. And, if this made *JESUS* a
 “ Sharer in their Destruction, it may as well be
 “ said, that *GOD* is answerable for all the Evil
 “ done in the World; nay, He will come in for
 “ a Share in this very Destruction of the Swine,
 “ for He too permitted it.” * What Exceptions
 the *Enquirer* has to this way of reasoning, he
 has not told us, nor can I guess. It is found-
 ed on comparing the *Evangelists* together, and
 suffering them to explain one another. And
 whereas this Gentleman says, “ It is not like any
 “ thing in our Saviour’s whole Character be-
 “ sides,” if he means, that this is the only
 Case, wherein our *LORD* displayed His Power
 to destroy, (supposing this had been done here)
 he surely forgets the Instance of the *Fig-tree*,
 which, being *curst*, withered away.

ANOTHER Difficulty is, that “ it is somewhat
 “ odd, that evil Beings should incline or influ-
 “ ence Men to do an Act of Worship: or that
 “ they should expostulate with Him, and con-
 “ fess Him to be the Son of God, under the
 “ Influence of *Devils*, and by their Direction.”
 p. 81. The plain Answer to this is; that all this,
 as *odd* as some People may think it, is expressly
 set down in the *Gospels*; but the true Reason is

* *Miracles of Jesus Vindicated*, Part 2. p. 28. In the next
 Page, the Reader may see other Reasons; but what I have cited is
 enough for my present Purpose. —

not therein declared. The *Fact* therefore we are to believe: The *Cause* we need not concern our selves with. Not but, if we should say, that God, for the Manifestation of His Glory, and of his SON's Mission, forced even the *Devils* to bear Testimony to Him; I believe it would be easier to call the Supposition *odd*, than to disprove it. But really we must not, to avoid such Objections as these, admit the new Scheme. For, to use Dr. *Bekker's* Words, "it is much better to be ignorant of any thing, than to understand it in such a manner, that it cannot possibly be made approved*."

MUCH the same Answer I must give to the last Question asked on this Occasion. "Is it conceivable, that God should permit evil Spirits to take Possession of miserable Mortals, and suffer them to deprive us of our Reason, &c." Will this Gentleman say, that there can be no Reason, why God should permit this? If there may, 'tis no way inconceivable that He should do it; tho' the Reason be such as we know nothing of. That He permits us to be deprived of our Reason by some means or other, is too certain: If this be no Argument against His Justice and Goodness, it can be none to suppose this Affliction to happen by the means of *evil Spirits*. This is full as *conceivable* as the other. To what Purpose then are the

* Il vaut beaucoup mieux ignorer une chose, que de l'entendre en telle sorte qu'il soit impossible de la rendre approuvable. *Tom. 2. P. 356.*

following Remarks? “Madmen can neither
 “amend a former ill Life, nor be sensible of
 “the Reason of the Punishment laid upon
 “them.—Or is Madness the Punishment of
 “Wickedness?—Or, are none but *wicked Men*
 “*possessed?*” p. 82. If these Words prove any
 thing, they prove much more than, I believe,
 this Gentleman intended. They directly tend
 to set aside not only the Notion of *Possessions*, but
 of *Madness* in general. I never asserted, nay I
 plainly denied, that none but *wicked Men* were
possessed, *Essay*, p. 73. As little do I imagine,
 that none but such are afflicted with *Madness*.
 And I also agree, that a *Madman* cannot “a-
 “mend a former ill Life,” tho’ he should be
wicked, as sometimes this is undoubtedly the
 Case. This notwithstanding, God Almighty
 has been pleased to make *miserable Mortals* sub-
 ject to this Affliction: His Reasons are best
 known to Himself: But whatever they are,
 they will equally justify His permitting *evil*
Spirits to cause it.

HAVING now considered all these Difficulties,
 I may have leave to conclude, that they are but
 weak Objections against the *literal Sense*, and
 no just Grounds to induce us to leave it. Those
 against the new Scheme are quite of another
 Nature. The Reader may see them at large in
 the *Essay*: And very little has been replied.
 The *Farther Enquiry* leaves the greatest Part of
 them to shift for themselves. Let us however
 see what has been offered.

IN

IN order to account for the *Devil's* leaving the *Man*, and entering the *Swine*, the Gentleman mentioned two Solutions, the Order of which he has, in this last Piece, transposed. The first, here, is "taken from the Manner of Expression in the Case of *Gebazi* and *Naa-man*." I endeavoured to shew some Difference in the Manner of Expression, as first, whereas the *same Devils*, which left the Man, immediately enter'd the Swine, it was not *one and the same Leprosy* which afflicted the Prophet's Servant and the *Syrian*. "It did not pass from one to the other, nor was it immediately communicated." *Vid. Essay*, p. 66, 67. To this the Gentleman answers, "that the Madness of the Swine and that of the Men were the same in kind, and not one and the same Madness." p. 82. But certainly if *Madness* be here to be understood by the Word *Devils*, we can't conceive how *one and the same individual Madness* could be more strongly expressed. And if he "demands" farther "Proof", I fear, it will be out of the Power of Language to satisfy him.

A SECOND Difference I observed between these two Cases was, that *Gebazi's Leprosy* was *directly inflicted* by God, which can't be said of the *Swine*, or affirmed with Certainty of the Owners of them. This is said to be *nothing to the Purpose*, *Farther Enquiry*, p. 83. I ask his Pardon. A great "Difficulty arises on that Account." Madness carries no Infection with it, and therefore can be communicated from one Person

tempt, had not offered *one* Reason, to *shew* it.—
 To proceed——“ *Hesychius* interprets Πύθων, ὁ
 “ ἐγγαστήριμος ἢ ἐγγαστήριαν, and hence it
 “ is thought very probable, that the Person,
 “ that had the Art of speaking without
 “ moving his Lips, throwing his Voice as
 “ out of his Belly, was the same as having a
 “ *Spirit of Python.*” If the Words ἐγγαστήρι-
 μος, ἐγγαστήριαν always denote such a Per-
 son, this Consequence is just and good. But,
 if *Hesychius* himself, and others, make them
 relate to *Divination* and *Prophecy*, without any
 Hint of that *Art of speaking*, it must be equally
 as false, and groundless. Now, the Words of
Hesychius, which this Gentleman has quoted,
 are very clear to this Purpose. I cite them
 from *Farther Enquiry*. p. 85. in my Margin.
 * And therefore, if he “ were right in his No-
 “ tion, this *Pythonefs*” had a *Spirit of Divina-*
tion, and may still be a *Demoniack*. We may
 add, that both *Constantin* and *Stephens* interpret
 the Word ἐγγαστήριμος in such a manner, that
 if the *Spirit of Python* be understood according to
 the Sense of that Word, it can’t be thought to
 signify less †. And the old *Scholiast* on *Aristo-*
phanes,

* Ἐγγαστήριμος· τῶτον τινες ἐγγαστήριαν, οἱ δὲ περιμάνην λέ-
 γουσι. Φησὶ δὲ περὶ τῆς τρόπης τῆς ΜΑΝΤΕΪΑΣ καὶ Πλάτων ἐν τῷ σο-
 φιστῇ. Τῶτον ἡμῖς πυθῶνα καλεῖμεν. *Hesych.* Surely then, accor-
 ding to his Sentiment, the Word Πύθων related to *Divination*.
 And I observe, that the Passage in *Plato*, which the Gentleman
 thinks *Hesychius* means, is entirely concerning the *Madness* which
 attended *Prophecy*.

† Hoc autem nomine significatur qui è pelvi vel ex alio genere
 vasis vaticinia capit. Γάστρη enim genus vasis est.

N. B.

phanes is so far from believing, that that word implied nothing but a *Trick*, that he expressly says of *Eurycles*, that “like an ἐγγασρί-
 “ μῦθος, he is said to have uttered *true Prophecies*
 “ at *Athens*, thro’ some *Demon* he was posses-
 “ sed with,” and a little after, “Hence all *Pro-*
 “ *phets* are called ἐγγασρίται and εὐρυκλείται from
 “ *Eurycles* the first Instance*.”

THERE is then no Manner of Occasion to alter or blame our *English Translation*, which justly renders πνεῦμα πύθωνος a *Spirit of Divination*. This also agrees best with the Original of this Word. *Apollo* was called *Pythius*, and was supposed to preside over the *Oracle* at *Delphos*: Hence the *Priestesses* there were called Πύθωνες, Πυθόληπτοι, Πυθύμαντες: From thence, as *Grotius* has observed, the Word has been by little and little applied to such as act, i. e. prophesie, like them†. I conclude therefore, in Opposition to this Gentleman, that “this” Art may “plainly
 “ require an *evil Spirit*,” or some “Power,
 “ which must be derived from such a Cause.”

To consider fully all the Places of the *Old Testament*, where the *LXX.* has ἐγγασρίμῦθος,

N. B. If this Derivation be true, there is no Manner of Foundation for the Gentleman’s Sense, and very little indeed according to that which follows.—Aut certè, qui in ventre dæmonem habet responsa interrogantibus dantem.

Const. & H. Steph. in voc. ἐγγασρίμῦθος.

* Οὗτος ὡς ἐγγασρίμῦθος λέγεται Ἀθήνησι τὰ ληθῆ μανιεύοντες δια-
 ἐνυπάρχοντος αὐτῷ δαίμονος ——— Ἐγγασρίται δὲ καὶ Εὐρυκλείται ἰκα-
 λῶντο ἐντεῦθεν πάντες οἱ μανιεύοντες, ἀπὸ Ἐυρυκλείης πρῶτης τῆς τοιοῦ-
 τῆς. Schol. ad Aristoph. Vesp. l. 1014.

† Inde vox serpsit ad similia facientes. Grot. in loc.

M

and

and the *English, familiar Spirit*, would take up too much time. The *Witch of Endor* alone would require a long Dissertation: Neither can I think it answers any End to run over them, as the Gentleman has done, in three Pages. He would have them all relate to the Art of throwing the Voice, as if it came from other Persons, and other Places. But there have been few, *very few*, Instances of these: Whereas the others are spoken of as *frequent* and *common*, as *continually* inciting People to Idolatry, and against whom, as well as against those, that applied to and consulted them, there were the severest Laws.

THE Gentleman, p. 90. thinks, “ there are
 “ some Instances, where those, who plead for
 “ the *Letter*, — will be hard put to it to act
 “ consistently. e. g. *Luke xi. 14. He was cast-*
 “ *ing out a Devil, and it [the Devil] was dumb.*
 “ Now, which is most easy and natural to sup-
 “ pose a *Devil* to be dumb; or to say, that a
 “ Man was, thro’ Melancholy moping, or *sul-*
 “ *len*, and *would not speak?* ” That is, of two
 Errors, which is most easy and natural? We
 need not answer such a Question; we may a-
 void them both: If this be all our Difficulty,
 we shall, I trust, come off pretty well. Let
 our Rule be, not to keep to the *Letter*, when
 there is a Necessity of departing from it, and
 yet to depart from it no longer, than such Ne-
 cessity lasts; and we shall *act consistently enough*.
 Thus, with regard to the Text before us. To
 attribute

attribute *Dumbness* personally to the *Devil*, appears to be groundless and idle : Here therefore there seems to be Occasion to leave the *Letter*. But to understand the *Devil* as the *Cause* of such *Dumbness*, is very easy and intelligible. We need not therefore go any farther from it ; and consequently, by all the Rules of Construction, we ought not ;

NOR indeed *can* we, without Absurdity. To make *Madness* the Cause of *Dumbness* is what neither Reason nor Experience will warrant. And yet, to say, “ that when that Disorder, “ which was imputed to a *Demon*, viz. Madness, was cured, the *dumb Man* spoke,” seems to be representing the one as the Cause of the other. If *speaking* was the immediate and necessary Consequence of the *Cure*, it is fairly implied, that the Loss of the Power of Speech was owing to the *Distemper*. But how is “ *Dumbness* a common Effect of *Melancholy* ? ” as is asserted, p. 91.

THIS indeed is avoided by changing the *Dumbness* into *Sullenness*, which may be a common Effect of *Madness*. But then this Change is perfectly arbitrary, void of all Foundation and Authority. It may with equal Reason be said, that the *Blindness* was nothing but *Stubbornness* and *Obstinacy*. We might make strange Work of *Scripture*, if such Liberties were allowed. This I observed before, and also, that such an Explication tends, *in some measure*, to set “ aside “ the Miracle ; —since *Sullenness*, of what kind

“foever, may well be conceived to be cured,
 “without any Miracle.” The Gentleman answers, that “this is saying, that the Effect of
 “a real Distemper, which appears very common in Life, and which is *cured by a Word*,
 “is setting aside the Miracle.” I am not sure, whether I understand these Words; * but if I do, he very much mistakes my Meaning. I never said, that to suppose *Sullenness* only was *setting aside* the whole *Miracle*, but only, that it *tends in some measure* to do it. My Reason is this. To represent any Disease, or any Circumstance of it, in such a manner, that the immediate Cure requires no *supernatural Power*, tends *in whole*, or *in part*, to destroy the Miracle. But *Sullenness*, whether arising from *Melancholy* or otherwise, might be immediately conquered by *Terrors*, or *Persuasions*, or other *human Means*. So far therefore here was no no Necessity for any *supernatural Power*, and consequently so far here might be no Miracle. And a Man, not inclined to believe, may suggest farther, that the *Madness* was *counterfeited*, and the *sullen* Person a secret Accomplice of our LORD; which cannot be pretended on the *common Scheme*.

“IF then every Circumstance of this Cause
 “can be accounted for by τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, something that is natural and common to Man,

* Something, I apprehend, here is omitted; the Sentence, as it stands at present, not appearing to be Sense, or English.

“ what Occasion is there to recur to *evil Spirits?*” p. 92. I might ask, can *real Dumbness* be caused by *Madness*? This has not hitherto been proved. But, were it so, where the *Scriptures* ascribe any Disorders to *evil Spirits*, we have Reason to believe them, however *natural* and *common* the Disorders may be. This was shew'd fully in the *Essay*, p. 14, 15, 16. which should, methinks, have been answered, before the like Pretence had been repeated.

THE following Questions favour more of Banter, than a serious *Enquiry*. “ Could not “ the *evil Spirit* move the Man's Tongue, or “ *would* he not? Or did he take away the Use, “ the natural Use of it? ” I have owned, that “ the Loss of Speech was owing to him,” and this Gentleman has not proved this to be improbable. He goes on, “ Sometimes we find “ Men represented as *speaking* too much — “ under the Influence of *Devils*. — Here, on “ the contrary,—the Man was *dumb*, by reason of the *Devil*: Strange Oddness!” Let us for once leave out the Mention of the *Devil*, and insert *Madness* in its place, and see how the Case will stand then. The *Enquirer*, *Enquiry*, p. 67. supposed that the *Madman* cried out “ in “ consequence of his Distemper,” and such were rebuked by our LORD for doing so. “ Some- “ times” then “ we find Men represented as “ *speaking* too much,” in consequence of *Madness*; “ here, on the contrary, the Man was *dumb*, “ by reason of” *Madness*. “ Strange Oddness! “ thus

“ thus to harrafs Men both ways ! to make them
 “ speak too much, and to make them speak
 “ nothing at all ! ” We see the Effects are the
 same, on both Suppositions : And I would fain
 know why it should be more inconsistent to at-
 tribute them to *evil Spirits*, than to *Madness* ?

I THOUGHT it “ inconsistent and unreason-
 “ able, to impute Declarations of Truth and
 “ Soberness *constantly* and *perpetually* to *Mad-*
 “ *ness*.” To this it is answered, that “ they
 “ that are acquainted with *Physick* at all, know
 “ that there are lucid Intervals in Madmen :
 “ They know what surprizingly just things
 “ Madmen will say.” p. 93. This is indeed
 true, but does not remove the Difficulty, which
 lies here, that this did not happen only once or
 twice, but *constantly* and *perpetually*. And tho’
 there are some particular Subjects, on which
 such unfortunate Persons *always* rave, *i. e.* such
 as have a direct Relation to the Cause of their
 Disorder ; yet I never heard that there were
 any, on which they *always* speak, with the
 most surprizing Sobriety and Consistency. Be-
 sides, as these Declarations, if supposed to come
 from *Devils*, are quite natural and intelligible ;
 we have no occasion to have Recourse to *Mad-*
ness, and the sudden Alterations which may
 possibly attend it, to explain them.

ALL that remains now, is to consider the
 Gentleman’s Answers to a few Questions I ask-
 ed. The first of which was, “ From whence
 “ proceeded the common Opinion, that these
 “ Disorders

“ Disorders were owing to *Demons* ? ” To this we have several Answers from p. 96 to 104. A short View of them may be sufficient. 1. He says, “ Suppose it were a Matter impossible to trace the Steps of this Notion, yet it might be common then.” This Answer is certainly just, but would besit any one better than those, who are inclined to object against Truths, because they can’t answer all Questions concerning them. And the *Essay*, p. 98. owned this to be “ one of those Difficulties, which are Matter of mere Curiosity, and of no Importance to the Determination of the Question.” “ But,” as it there follows, “ so are those objected to the *literal* Meaning. And if our Curiosity must be gratified in the one Case, why not in the other ? ”

HOWEVER, we have an Attempt to solve this. The same, which the Atheistical *Lucretius* made the Ground of the common Belief of GOD’S *Providence*, the Gentleman has had Recourse to, to account for the vulgar Opinion concerning *Demoniacs*, viz. the *Ignorance of natural Causes*. “ The Ignorance of the Causes of very remarkable and odd Symptoms in *Epilepticks*, and the strange Alienation of Mind in others, without *Fever* or such like Indisposition, led People, I think, to impute that to *Demons*, which otherwise they could not account for,” p. 97. The Improbability of this we have seen already. It has appeared that the *Jews* knew both the *Epilepsy* and *Madness*,

ness, spoke of them as common natural Disorders, and therefore were not, thro' *Ignorance*, induced to attribute them to *Demons*. And farther, supposing that these were acknowledged by *them* to be the *Souls* of *departed Men*, which is not true; the Question will still remain, from whence did the common Opinion proceed, that these were able to occasion any Diseases?

It is urged, 3dly. That *Fortune* and the *Fever* were *deified*, p. 97, 98. What then? Will this help us to account for the Origin of the *Jewish* Belief about *Demoniacs*? What Similitude can there be, between representing Accidents and Disorders as Persons, and ascribing real Effects to real Beings, without any manner of Resemblance or Foundation?

THE next Plea is, that "since it is not a self-evident Truth, that these Disorders are owing to *Demons*, it ought to be proved, that *They are the Cause*." This is no Answer to my Question. Whether they were so or not, they were believed to be such. *Whence this Belief, if false?* — "The Question has been put more than once to Ancients, as well as Moderns, how they knew such and such Persons were possessed by the Devil?" p. 98, 99. I must beg to be excused, if I do not enter upon an Examination of some *later* Instances which this Gentleman produces. The Subject of this Debate is the *Demoniacs in the New Testament*. And, if the Question above were asked concerning these, I think the Answer very easy.
Their

Their Disorders are imputed to *Demons*: These, I have proved to be, in the Sense of the *New Testament Writers*, *Devils*: The *Scripture* therefore tells us, that "such Persons were *possessed by the Devil*;" Thus then we *know* them to be so; we can't reasonably desire better Proof. I will go one Step farther, and add, that the *ancient Apologists* might easily know some in their Days to be *really possessed*, the *Devils*, at leaving them, being forced to confess their Nature.

My Second Question was, "Whence were "all their *Pharisees* and *Doctors* deceived?" *Essay*, p. 98, 99. This is answered by another Question, "What if the *Pharisees* did believe "that certain Distempers were owing to *Demons*, as much as the common People did?" Why then, I say, that this Belief is *more likely* to be true: The more learned Men are, the less liable are they to be deceived thro' *Ignorance*, or *Superstition*. The *Pharisees* and *Doctors* in this Case had no Interest to serve. Nay, could they have disproved this Opinion, they had had some Matter of Exception against our LORD. Had this Opinion been without Foundation, among so many Instances, it would not have been difficult to have disproved it; and it is highly probable they would have undertaken to do so. Could they have shewn, that *Beelzebub* was no way concerned in those *Possessions*, they needed not to have fram'd so idle a Charge, as that our SAVIOUR'S Cures were owing to the Aid of That *wicked Spirit*. This therefore shews,

N

that

that they were well assured of the common Opinion, and adds some Confirmation to it.

AGAIN, I asked, " what were the *Naturalists* and *Physicians* then doing, that they did " not inform the World ?" *Essay*, p. 99. They were more particularly concerned to destroy such an Hypothesis, and to banish such Language out of the World. And yet St. Luke uses this as freely as any of the others. " What " if it may be shewn," says the *Enquirer*, *Further Enquiry*, p. 105, " that the *Naturalists* and " *Physicians* did speak against that Notion ? " Let it be shewn then. " Did not *Hippocrates* " write against the *Epilepsy*'s being caused by *De-* " *mons* ? Has not *Pliny* said enough ? Has not " *Plotinus* ? And have not others spoke against " the Thing ? " Not to insist, that I might expect the Opinions of some old *Physicians*, among the *Jews*, as all my Questions evidently related to the Belief current with them ; I ask, does any one of these prove, that *Evil Spirits* had not Power to cause Distempers ? *Hippocrates* has only said, that the *Epilepsy* in general, every Instance of this Disorder, was not owing to *Demons* ; but he never intended to prove, that no particular Case, even of the *Epilepsy*, could be justly ascribed to *Devils*. Nor do the Words of *Plotinus* imply this. He, as far as I can judge by the Quotation, intended only to expose a ridiculous Humour of ascribing all Manner of Distempers to *Devils*, even such Instances as were cured by human Means only-- As therefore the Instances of *Demoniacks* were a great

great Reproach to the Faculty of *Physick*, there is no doubt, but they were desirous to have exposed them, if they had proceeded from *natural Causes* alone: As they did not attempt to shew this, we may conclude, that they looked upon the *common Opinion*, as well founded.

BUT the Question of most Consequence is still to come. "Why would JESUS himself countenance such a Notion as this, if there were really no such Things as *Demons*, nor Persons possessed by them?" If the Reader will please to turn to the *Essay*, he may find this urged p. 99,--102. To all which the Gentleman thinks it "sufficient to answer, that he made use of Words which Custom had sanctified — He has said nothing to affirm or deny the Power of *Demons*, nor was it to his Purpose; but he used the Language that others did." *Further Enquiry*, p. 105. To be perpetually repeating is as disagreeable to myself, as to the Readers. Yet I hope they will excuse me, if I once more remind them, that our LORD argued upon the Supposition, that *Possessions* were owing to the Power of *Satan*; that he expressly attributed one Instance of Disease to this; and therefore confirmed the Hypothesis commonly received.

I MUST also beg leave to observe again, that "it was to His Purpose to deny the Power of *Demons*," if he had not acknowledged it; That the Supposition was not a merely indifferent Matter, a merely *physical* Mistake, but one that *naturally* tends to introduce Superstiti-

on. As this is a Point of great Moment, I will set down the Answer to it at length. " One would imagine, that from a Person's " being called a *Demoniack*, or that from a " Name's implying some heathen Deity to be " the Cause of an Illness, some great Danger " was instantly to arise." p. 106. This is a very partial Representation of the Case. For, does the *Scripture* give no more Countenance to the Notion, than by using the Word *Demoniack*? Were not *Demons* believed by the *Jews* to be *evil Spirits*? And are they not in the *New Testament* spoken of as *real Persons*, with such Language and Actions ascribed to them, as are very suitable to the Nature of those *wicked Spirits*, but not at all so to that of *departed Souls*? And does not all this tend to raise Apprehensions of the *Power* of those Beings? And is it agreeable to the End of our LORD's coming into the World to suppose, that He would not have delivered us from such Apprehensions, had they been groundless? " But, as the Gentleman goes on, " is it necessary " before a *Physician* cures, or a *Naturalist* explains, the Case of the *Venereal* Distemper, " that he must shew, that *Venus* is an Imaginary Being? Does it lead to a superstitious " Regard to that *Goddeſs* one whit to have a " Distemper called by her Name?" The Cases are very disparate. The BLESSED JESUS came neither as a *Physician*, nor as a *Naturalist*, but as a Divine Restorer of Mankind, to rectify their false Notions about religious Matters, and to

turn

turn Men from the Power of Satan unto God. He found them fully persuaded of the Power of that *evil* Being, and keeping up this Persuasion by a Belief that he was the Author of several Distempers. Now suppose that *Venus* was really and commonly thought to cause the *French Disease*, and a new Prophet was sent to restrain her Power for the present, and finally to subdue her; would he in this Case use the common Language, if he did not believe the common Sentiment? Would he confirm any false Opinion of her Power, whom he came to destroy? Thus, with Regard to the *Saint Anthony's Fire*, which the *Enquirer* again lays a Stress upon. Were this Disorder generally believed to proceed from that *Saint*, would not a Prophet, whose Business was to destroy his Worship and Honour, naturally tell us, that he has no such Power as is pretended? Could such Idolatry be better prevented or overturned?

MOST of those, who have wrote against the common Opinion about Possessions, have charged it as the Parent of Superstitions. *Becker* says expressly, that the *Christian Religion is no Ways consistent with this Opinion* †. But this has been shewn to be the same that prevailed among the *Jews*, in our *Saviour's* Time. According to that Account therefore it was absolutely necessary for Him to destroy this Belief and Language, so contrary to the Doctrine he came to teach.

† La Religion Chretienne ne peut nullement subsister avec l'Opinion que je vien de combattre.

Le monde enchanté. Tom. 2. p. 688.

THE Gentleman may well say, as he does *Farther Enquiry*, p. 107. " I leave now the
 " Difficulties, which raised at first this Enqui-
 " ry, with the Answers to them, to every
 " Reader's Judgment." For, though I men-
 tioned three or four Solutions of the main Dif-
 ficulty, which had been given by very good
 Writers, and which, " both in Regard to the
 " Authority of their respective Authors, and
 " their real intrinsick Weight," I still think,
 deserve " to have been well considered," *Essay*,
 p. 120. He has not once afforded one of them
 the least Word of Answer. But were I to
 take Notice of every Omission of this Kind,
 the Reader perhaps might think his Patience
 trifled with.

I SHALL detain him but a very little longer,
 only to examine the Truth of what the Gen-
 tleman urges to shew, that the Miracle in,
 his Sense, " is *greater*, and more worthy of
 " our Saviour, than if it be understood in the
 " common Way." Very little depends on this,
 should it be granted. In both Manners of con-
 sidering it, it is a *real Miracle*, a *great* one,
worthy of our SAVIOUR, and clearly demonstra-
 tive of His Divine Mission. Nor is that Sense,
 in which it appears most glorious, on this Ac-
 count *only*, the true one. However, I can't but
 think, that the *Enquirer* has also failed in the
 Proof of this. His Reasons are these ; " Would
 " not they that heard such a Confession from
 " such a *Liar*, be apt to be confounded, and
 " disbelieve the Confession, from the known
 " Nature

' Nature of the Being that made it? " And
 suppose they did disbelieve it, as we have no
 Reason to think they did not, what will follow?
 That they were not *Devils* that made it? No
 surely—And will not the Objection be much
 the same, if we suppose these Confessions made
 by *Madmen*? Would the one procure CHRIST
 more Honour than the other? Or, be more
 likely to be believed? It was not therefore
 from the *Confessions* of either, that His Glory
 arose *so much*, as from His *ejecting* or *curing*
 them. And the chief Question will be, which
 most displayed Divine Power, to cast out *De-*
vils, or to cure *Madness*, &c? The *Gentle-*
man states the Comparison very unfairly? He
 asks, " Which is an Instance of the *greatest*
 " Power, to command an Inferior to depart
 " one's Presence, which if he refuses to do,
 " one can turn him out, whether he will or
 " no, or to correct the Juices or Solids of a
 " disordered Body, and regulate its Motions,
 " by a Word?" Both are certainly equally
 easy to *Divine Power*; Both certainly requir'd
 such. As this can't admit of Degrees, it seems
 an improper Way of speaking, that one is an
 Instance of *greater Power* than the other. Where-
 as, the true Question is, which most tends to
 manifest and display *Divine Power*, to shew, that
 the Juices and Solids of a human Body, were
 subject to our LORD, or that the most *virulent*,
obstinate and *powerful Spirits* were inferior to
 Him, and obedient to His Word? Whether the
 Cure of a common *Madness* or *Epilepsy*, or of such

as are caused by *Devils*, be the most glorious and extraordinary? Now, in order to determine this, we may consider, that the Body is equally *disordered* according to this last Supposition, as according to the first; that here there was equal Need to *correct* its *Juices* and *Solids*, and to *regulate* its *Motions*. This therefore our LORD did miraculously, according to either Hypothesis; but if we take that of *real Possessions*, he, besides this, forced the *Devils* themselves to cease to disorder the Bodies of Men in such Ways, and to leave them, tho' with Reluctance——Here therefore there is a clear, *additional* Sign of *Divine Power*.

I now take my leave of this Subject, and of the *Further Enquiry*, not being conscious of having left any thing material relating to myself, or to the general Question, unconsider'd. I shall conclude with warning the Reader how idle it is to lay such a Stress on every *Doubt* and *Difficulty*, as inclines us to recur to *forced* and *violent* Interpretations of *Scripture*, and with reminding him of the Necessity, of being modest, watchful and cautious, of the Dangers which attend *Presumption* and *Security*, and which we are liable to be betrayed into, by a Forgetfulness of the *Number*, *Power*, and *Malice* of our *spiritual Enemies*; and lastly, with entreating him to consider, how much it becomes us, in this State of *Frailty* and *Danger*, to confide in the DIVINE GRACE AND MERCY.



